



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>





600010675P

26.343.

THE
BOOK
OF
CHURCHES AND SECTS;
OR
THE OPINIONS
OF
ALL DENOMINATIONS OF CHRISTIANS
DIFFERING FROM THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND,
TRACED TO THEIR SOURCE BY AN EXPOSITION OF THE VARIOUS
TRANSLATIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS
OF
THE SACRED WRITINGS:
TO WHICH IS ADDED,
A BRIEF REFUTATION OF UNITARIANISM,
AND AN ARRANGEMENT OF TEXTS IN SUPPORT OF THE TENETS OF THE
Church of England.

BY THE
REV. T. CHARLES BOONE, B.A.
OF ST. PETER'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

“ It is the proud privilege of Truth to solicit inquiry.”—D'OYLY.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR C. AND J. RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD,
WATERLOO-PLACE, AND 148, STRAND.

1826.

343.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY R. GILBERT,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.



INTRODUCTION.

IN submitting the present volume to the public, the compiler is aware, that its materials, although now arranged in a new shape, are to be found in works, of which the greater part are well known, and some of but recent publication ; and he therefore feels bound to state, in justice to himself, that he had originally no other object in view, than an addition to his own stock of theological knowledge.

Having, however, amassed no inconsiderable number of notes, and arranged them nearly as they now stand, it occurred to him, that they might afford much interesting information, compressed in a small compass, to the young student in divinity ; and even, perhaps, prove generally useful, as forming a book of reference.

The *object* of this work is to point out the disputed passages, if the expression may be allowed, of the New Testament, and under those passages to subjoin a succinct account of the tenets and customs of the various sects to which so many opposite interpretations of Scripture have given

rise. Thus, according to this plan, the reader becomes acquainted at once with the *creed* of any particular denomination of Christians, and the *basis* upon which that creed is founded.

As to the *manner of execution*, it has been the wish of the compiler, whenever it has been practicable, to give the opinions of any particular sect in their own words. Thus, the articles headed "Unitarianism" are either literal extracts from the Unitarian Version, or are the remarks of some acknowledged advocate of Unitarianism upon *the particular passage in question*; without any comment whatever from the compiler of this work. If the reader will turn to the first note in this volume, he will find it printed with inverted commas, denoting it as a quotation. It is, in fact, a literal extract from the Unitarian Version, containing their arguments for holding the remainder of the first chapter of St. Matthew, &c. as spurious.

In the same manner, when at the end of an article the words "Note to the Roman Catholic Version" occur, it is to be understood, that the article itself is a literal extract from the Roman Catholic Version of the New Testament, to which version notes are affixed, as explanatory of the Roman Catholic doctrine.

In the case of a much disputed passage, it is necessary to remark, that the opinions are classed in chronological order; and if this rule has been occasionally abandoned, it is presumed that the reason will be obvious to the reader, as the devi-

ation has arisen, in almost every instance, from the wish, either to preserve a strict connection between two or more adjoining notes, where such connection was a matter of importance, or to give a priority of place to those opinions which appeared to possess a peculiar degree of consequence from the celebrity of their authors, or the number of their adherents.

Those persons who wish to become acquainted with the peculiar tenets of any one sect, say Quakers, e. g. have only to refer to the table of Contents, where, under the word "Quakers," they will find all the passages enumerated in which this sect is mentioned ; which passages, taken collectively, form a *complete account* of their tenets. By referring also to the index at the end of the volume, the reader will find some of the texts by which the Church of England is guided, opposed to the opinions of the different sects.

As so much depends upon the sources whence we derive the opinions of sectarians of former centuries, the compiler has occasionally given a list of authorities referred to, instead of the name of the work from which he immediately drew his information. At least, he has taken this liberty when extracting from the Dictionnaire des Hérésies, Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, or minor publications modelled upon that excellent work : but rarely in any other instance.

With regard to the *tendency* of the present publication, a very few words must be sufficient to

demonstrate, that it may be of essential service to the cause of sound religion ; and that it may eventually have the effect of weaning many from the errors of heterodoxy and dissent. For when we consider how ready, on the one hand, are some of the enemies of the establishment to take advantage of the ignorant and unwary ; and how soon, on the other, “ men, wrapped up in the intricacies of business, or the pursuits of pleasure, are startled by objections which they are not competent to answer*,” can we deny the utility of a work, which informs the inexperienced members of the establishment what weapons they will find in their adversaries’ hands, which invites them to an earnest examination of the moderate, but scriptural doctrines of their own church, and which urges them to ask themselves upon what ground they have taken up their faith?

A Roman Catholic writer tells us with astonishment, that “ *malgré les croisades qui avaient exterminé tant d’Hérétiques, malgré les Inquisiteurs qui en avaient fait brûler une infinité, malgré les bûchers allumés dans toute l’Europe contre les Sectaires, on voyait à chaque instant naître de nouvelles sectes, qui bientôt se divisaient en plusieurs autres,*” &c. But to the enlightened Protestant this affords no matter of astonishment. He is aware that many errors, which had been fostered by persecution, were annihilated so soon as fair

* Watson’s Apology for the Bible.

examination and cool argument were employed against them; and he regards these as the only weapons which will be found effectual in eradicating the errors which still exist.

It is, however, to be observed, that this work is not addressed to the *superficial* reader. It is addressed to those only, who are anxious to be "*ready to give an answer to every man that asketh them a reason of the hope that is in them:*" who are willing to "*search the Scriptures,*" and so to read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest, that they may not be "*tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine.*" It is addressed to those who, while they read its pages, will also have before them D'Oyly and Mant's edition of the Bible, to which the compiler refers as the organ of the Church of England, and as containing a refutation of the erroneous opinions detailed in this volume; for it must be remembered, that this compilation consists only of opinions (with a few exceptions, as for example, the Calvinistic doctrines, relating to which the members of the establishment themselves differ,) in opposition to those of the Church of England; the sentiments of this church being so ably collected and arranged in the edition of the Bible to which allusion has just been made, as to render any other similar attempt vain and superfluous.

The reader is, moreover, strongly recommended to procure Nares' "*Remarks on the Unitarian Version,*" and Rennell's "*Animadversions on the*

Unitarian Translation," if he have them not already.

To a member of the Church of England it must always be a painful task to peruse, much more to give publicity to, the Unitarian tenets. Such, at least, it has proved to the compiler of this volume. But, acquainted as he is with the incessant efforts of the Unitarians to force their opinions upon the public; acquainted also with the effects which these opinions have produced upon persons, who believed them to be new and founded upon a more perfect acquaintance with Scripture; he felt the necessity of a publication, which should fairly and unreservedly display their sentiments, and also point out the sandy foundation upon which these sentiments rest.

However brief the annexed refutation (collected from modern writings of our eminent divines) may be, the compiler feels assured, that it must establish conviction in every unprejudiced mind. Should it prove deficient in this respect, he has undertaken a task which he will have shewn himself unfit to perform.

It is, perhaps, unnecessary to state, that in the annexed Refutation of Unitarianism, he could only dwell upon the leading tenets, as he must otherwise have increased this work to a size which would have defeated his purpose in the publication, viz. of compressing much useful information in an octavo volume. He therefore refers the reader (about to examine the Unitarian statements) in addition

to the books mentioned, to Dr. Magee's celebrated work on the Atonement; Dr. Waterland's "Vindication of Christ's Divinity;" Dr. Waterland on "the Trinity;" Bishop Pearson's works; Falconer's Eight Discourses, delivered before the University of Oxford, 1810; Bell on the "Divine Mission of John the Baptist and Jesus Christ;" and Dr. Laurence's "Critical Reflections upon some important Misrepresentations contained in the Unitarian Version of the New Testament."—The reader is particularly referred to this work of Dr. Laurence, in which he will find a refutation of the Unitarian opinions respecting Satan, Angels, &c.

At the conclusion of these prefatory remarks, the writer has only to express his hope, that he may have increased the general admiration of the venerable fabric of the Church of England, by having directed the eye to the deformities and inconsistencies of the minor buildings erected around it. He is indeed confident that such must be the *end* of our inquiry into the truths of God, under whatever impressions it may have been commenced, and with whatever feelings it may have been carried on. He would therefore say, in the words of Dr. D'Oyly, "never let us, for a single moment, tolerate the idea of shrinking from the most nice and severe examination of the grounds on which our faith is founded." Not only because such examination must unavoidably increase our veneration for the established religion

of our country, but because we are earnestly exhorted by St. Paul himself to “**PROVE ALL THINGS, *but finally to HOLD FAST that which is good.***”

CONTENTS.

	Page
ABECEDARIANS. 1 Cor. iii. 19.	217
ABELARD. 1 John v. 7. No. 5.	481
ADOPTIANS. Gal. iv. 5.	305
ÆONS. 1 Pet. iv. 1.	465
AGNOETÆ, or NESCIENTS. Matt. xxiv. 36. No. 2.	64
AMALRIC. 2 Cor. v. 17.	275
AMMONIUS SACCUS. 1 Tim. vi. 20. No. 3.	397
AMSDORF. Ephes. ii. 9.	328
ANABAPTISTS, their opinion concerning departed souls. Luke	
xvi. 22. No. 5.	103
——— practice with respect to things strangled.	
Acts xv. 20. No. 1.	163
——— mode of performing baptism, &c.—different	
sentiments upon the Arminian controversy. Eph.	
iv. 5. No. 4.	331
ANTINOMIANS, their tenets, &c. Acts xiii. 39. (P. 162.)	
Rom. iii. 20. (P. 176.) v. 1. No. 2. (P. 181.)	
viii. 30. No. 1. (P. 198.) viii. 33. No. 2.	
(P. 201.) 1 Cor. i. 23. (P. 213.) 2 Cor. v.	
21. No. 1. (P. 278.) Heb. xii. 24. (P. 447.)	
APOLLINARIS. Matt. i. 20. No. 1.	3
APOLLONIUS TYANÆUS. Matt. xxiv. 24. No. 1.	61
APOSTOLICS. James v. 12. No. 2.	454
APOTACTITES. Gal. vi. 8. No. 1.	313
ARDEUS. Mark xvi. 19.	88
ARIUS AND ARIANS, their dispute on the passage, Matt. xxiv.	
36. No. 1.	64
——— doctrine concerning Christ. John	
i. 1. No. 1. (P. 108.) xiv. 28. (P. 144.)	
——— the Holy Ghost.	
2 Cor. xiii. 14. No. 4.	288
——— difference of opinion between the first	
and more modern Arians with respect to	
worship. Rom. i. 25. (P. 174.) 1 Tim.	
ii. 8. (P. 374.)	
——— the distinction between High, Semi, and	
Low Arians. Heb. i. 2. No. 1.	412

ARMINIUS, the reason of his followers being denominated "Remonstrants," the churches or sects which are Arminian, &c. Rom. v. 19. No. 4.	189
—— the five points of dispute between the Calvinists and Arminians. Rom. viii. 33. No. 1.	200
ASCETICS. 1 John ii. 15.	474
AUGUSTINE, ST. Ephes. ii. 3. No. 1.	322
AUSTIN, ST. Luke xx. 36.	104
AVERROES. John xiv. 9. No. 2.	141
BAPTISTS, (SEVENTH-DAY). Acts xviii. 4. No. 2. (P. 165.) See Anabaptists, Ephes. iv. 5. No. 4.	
BARDESANES, his reason for concluding that Jêsus Christ had not assumed a human body. John i. 14. No. 3.	115
—— Satan is not the creature of God. 2 Cor. ii. 11. No. 2.	266
—— his theory concerning man before the Fall. 2 Cor. iv. 4.	271
—— the resurrection. 1 Cor. xv. 44. No. 1.	259
BARSUMAS OF NISIBIS. Rom. v. 10. No. 2.	186
—— (THE ABBOT.) John i. 14. No. 5.	116
BASILIDES. 2 Cor. ii. 11. No. 2.	267
BASILIUS. Rom. x. 12.	205
BEHMEN, JACOB. 1 Cor. xii. 10. No. 4.	239
BEREANS. 1 Tim. iv. 14. No. 5.	390
BERNARD OF THURINGE. Rev. xx. 2.	501
BERYLLUS. Coloss. i. 17. No. 1.	359
BOGOMILES. Rom. x. 12.	205
BRETHREN OF THE FREE SPIRIT. Rom. viii. 2.	193
BROWN AND BROWNISTS, their objection to the Church of England, &c. 1 Cor. xvi. 19.	264
—— regulations concerning Bap- tism and the Lord's Supper. Matt. xxvi. 26. No. 10.	71
CÆLESTIUS, his doctrine of original sin. Rom. v. 19. No. 3. (P. 189.) 1 Cor. xv. 22. No. 1. (P. 249.)	
—— opinion concerning grace. Eph. ii. 8. No. 1.	321
CAIANUS. Matt. i. 20. No. 2.	4
CALVIN, his opinion concerning justification. Rom. v. 1. No. 1.	181
—— predestination. Rom. viii. 29. No. 2.	197
—— God's elect. Rom. viii. 33. No. 1. (P. 200.) Ephes. ii. 8. No. 3. (P. 322.)	
—— on the extensive signification of the passage, 2 Cor. vii. 11.	280
—— the founder of Presbytery. 1 Tim. iv. 14. No. 1.	377
CAMERONIANS. 1 Tim. iv. 14. No. 5.	390

CONTENTS.

xiii

	Page
CAMPANUS. 2 Cor. xiii. 14. No. 6.	288
CARDINALS. Matt. xvi. 18. No. 4.	41
CARLOSTAD. 1 Cor. iii. 19.	217
CARPOCRATES, his wild ideas. Matt. v. 25.	15
----- probably the first person who asserted the simple humanity of Christ. Heb. ii. 17. No. 1.	427
CERDO. 1 Tim. vi. 20. No. 4.	398
CERINTHUS, his doctrine, &c. 1 Pet. iv. 1. No. 1. (P. 464.)	
Rev. xx. 4. No. 1. (P. 502.)	
COCCEIUS, his method of interpreting Scripture. Eph. vi. 19.	
No. 3. (P. 346.) Rev. viii. 1. (P. 494.)	
COLLYRIDIAN. Matt. i. 24. No. 1.	5
COPTS, their custom with respect to circumcision, &c. Acts	
xv. 1. 20. No. 2.	163
CREATICOLE. Matt. i. 20. No. 2.	4
CUDWORTH, WILLIAM. 1 Cor. i. 23.	213
DAMIANISTS. 1 John v. 7. No. 3.	480
DANCERS. Heb. ii. 12. No. 2.	425
DE LA PLACE. Rom. v. 19. No. 2.	188
DOMINICAN MONKS, their dispute with the Franciscans concerning the blood of Christ. Ephes. i. 7.	
No. 1.	315
----- Jesuits concerning grace, predestination, human liberty, and original sin. Eph. ii. 8. No. 4.	323
DONATISTS. Matt. xxvi. 52.	75
DUNKERS, their rules concerning resistance of evil. Matt. v.	
39. No. 3.	23
----- preaching. Gal. i. 1. No. 3.	293
----- method of performing baptism. Ephes. iv. 5.	
No. 11.	338
EBIONITES, the beginning of their gospel. Matt. iii. 1.	6
----- disputes respecting it, &c. Gal. i. 6. No. 1.	294
ECLECTICS. 1 Cor. xii. 5. No. 1.	235
ELCESAITES. Gal. i. 6. No. 1.	294
ENCHRATITES, their custom in the administration of the Lord's	
Supper. Matt. xxvi. 26. No. 6.	69
----- abstinence. Gal. vi. 8. No. 1.	313
ERASTIANS. 1 Tim. iv. 14. No. 2.	381
EUCHYTES. 1 Thess. v. 17.	368
EUSTATHIUS. Gal. vi. 8. No. 2.	313
EUTYCHES AND EUTYCHIAN. John i. 14. No. 4.	115
FALSE CHRIST. Matt. xxiv. 24. Nos. 1, 2.	61, 62
FIFTH MONARCHY MEN. Rev. xx. 4. No. 3.	504
FLAGELLANTES, or WHIPPERS. 1 Cor. ix. 27. No. 4.	226
FORMALISTS. 1 John v. 7. No. 2.	479

FRANCISCAN MONKS , their assertion concerning the wounds on the body of St. Francis. Gal. vi. 17.	
No. 1.	314
dispute with the Dominicans. Eph. i. 7. No. 1.	315
FRATRES ALBATI, or WHITE BRETHREN. John i. 21. . . .	121
FRENCH CONVULSIONISTS. Heb. ii. 12. No. 2.	425
GLASS AND GLASSITES , their frequent celebration of the Lord's Supper, love-feasts, &c. Acts ii. 42.	154
strictness of discipline. 1 Cor. vi. 9. No. 2.	220
separation from the Kirk of Scotland. 1 Tim. v. 12. No. 5. . . .	390
GNOSTICS , difference between the Asiatic and Egyptian Gnostics. Mark i. 9. No. 1.	81
their opinion concerning the incarnation of Christ. John i. 14. No. 1.	115
matter, &c. 1 Tim. vi. 20. No. 1.	391
GODESCHALCUS. Eph. ii. 8. No. 2.	322
GREEK CHURCH , number of Lents and fasts. Matt. iv. 2. No. 2. (P. 11.) Gal. iv. 9. No. 3. (P. 307.)	
masses for the dead. Matt. xii. 32. No. 6.	33
application of the word "Papa." Matt. xvi. 18. No. 5.	42
fear of excommunication. Matt. xvi. 19. No. 5.	48
marriage of the clergy. Matt. xix. 11. No. 3.	51
sentiments concerning transubstantiation, &c. Matt. xxvi. 26. No. 3. (P. 67.) John vi. 63. (P. 131.)	
manner of communicating, &c. Matt. xxvi. 26. No. 4.	68
offices for the benediction of the water, &c. Mark i. 9. No. 2.	82
manner of performing baptism. Ephes. iv. 5. No. 8.	335
ceremony of the Lavipedium. John xiii. 14. No. 1.	139
the mystery of confession. 1 Cor. xi. 29. No. 2.	233
custom with respect to women. 1 Cor. xiv. 34. No. 1.	245
sentiments concerning the Holy Ghost, separation from the Latin Church, &c. &c. 2 Cor. xiii. 14. No. 1.	285
number of sacraments. Ephes. v. 32. No. 2.	342

XY

15

	Page
MAHOMET. John xvi. 7.	147
MALAKANS. Matt. iii. 11.	8
MANES AND MANICHÆANS, rules of their assembly. Matt.	
x. 2.	28
theory with relation to the evil	
principle. John viii. 44.	133
imposture of Manes. His wild	
opinions, &c. 1 Cor. xiii. 9.	
No. 1.	241
MARCIONITES, asserters of the Ditheistick doctrine. 1 Cor.	
xiii. 9. No. 1.	243
their theory, &c. 1 Tim. vi. 20. No. 4.	398
MARK. Rev. xxi. 6.	506
MENNONITES, their opinion concerning the body of Christ.	
Matt. i. 20. No. 3.	4
tenets relating to oaths. Matt. v. 33.	
No. 1. (P. 15.) and things strangled.	
Acts xv. 20. No. 1. (P. 163.)	
baptism, &c. Eph.	
iv. 5. No. 4.	331
MESSALIANS. 1 Thess. v. 17.	368
MILLENARIANS, their interpretation of the passage, Luke xxii.	
18.	105
opinions concerning the Millennium.	
Rev. xx. 4. No. 2.	503
MODALISTS. John xiv. 9. No. 1.	141
MOLINOS. Matt. xxii. 37.	59
MOLTHER, his notion of faith. Rom. v. 1. No. 5.	183
contributes to the breach between Wesley and the	
Moravians. Coloss. ii. 20.	366
MONARCHIANS. John xiv. 9. No. 1.	140
MONKS. Matt. xix. 21. No. 2.	53
MONOPHYSITES. John i. 14. No. 6.	117
MONOTHELITES. John v. 30.	127
MONTANUS, pretensions of his disciples. Acts xxi. 9. No. 1.	170
custom relating to the priesthood. Rom. xvi. 1.	
No. 2.	210
announced himself as the Comforter. 1 Cor. xiii.	
9. No. 2.	244
singular custom among his disciples. Eph. iv. 5.	
No. 1.	331
MORAVIANS, their custom after receiving the sacrament. John	
xiii. 14. No. 2.	139
with relation to the different sexes,	
&c. 1 Cor. xiv. 34. No. 2.	245
worship. 1 Tim.	
ii. 8.	374
matrimony. Heb.	
xiii, 4, No. 4.	450

CONTENTS.

vii

	Page
MORAVIANS, particulars concerning the sect, &c. Rev. xiv. 1.	497
MOSES CRETENSIS. 1 Cor. x. 2.	227
MYSTICS, their fanatical system. Matt. xxii. 37.	50
method of forcing scriptural phrases. 2 Pet. iii. 16. No. 2.	471
NAVELERS. Matt. xvii. 1.	40
NAZARENES. Gal. i. 6. No. 1.	294
NESTORIUS. Rom. v. 10.	185
NEW JERUSALEM CHURCH. 1 Cor. viii. 4.	228
NOETUS. John xiv. 9. No. 1.	140
NOMINALISTS. 1 John v. 7. No. 2.	477
NONCONFORMISTS. 1 Cor. x. 28.	280
NOVATIAN. 1 Tim. iii. 2. No. 4.	375
NOVATUS. Do.	ibid.
NUNS. Matt. xix. 21. No. 2.	53
OPHITES, or SERPENTINIANS. 2 Cor. xi. 3.	282
ORIGEN, his theory concerning the soul. Luke xvi. 22. No. 4. (P. 103.) xvi. 23. (P. 104.) xxiv. 39. (P. 107.) Acts x. 34. (P. 160.)	
Christ's body. Luke xxiv. 31.	106
soul. John i. 14.	
No. 2.	115
the Trinity. John xiv. 28.	
No. 1.	144
Christ's second crucifixion.	
Acts ii. 23.	153
the body after the resurrection. 1 Cor. xv. 52.	263
mode of interpreting Scripture, &c. Eph. vi. 19.	
No. 1.	345
PASAGINIANS, or PÆSAGII. Matt. v. 17.	14
PAUL OF SAMOSATA. Heb. ii. 17. No. 1.	427
PAULICANS, or PAULIANS, their interpretation of the bread and wine. Matt. xxvi. 26. No. 5.	68
baptismal water. Eph. iv. 5. No. 3.	331
rejected the Epistles of St. Peter. 1 Pet. i. 1.	460
PELAGIUS, his argument in favour of the possibility of arriving at perfection. Matt. v. 48. No. 1.	24
sentiments concerning original sin. Rom. v. 19. No. 3. (P. 189.) 1 Cor. xv. 22. No. 1. (P. 249.)	
grace. Eph. ii. 8. No. 1.	321
infant baptism. Ephes. iv. 5. No. 2.	331
works. James ii. 24.	454

	Page
PHILOPONUS. 1 Cor. xv. 53.	264
PHOTINUS. 2 Cor. xiii. 14. No. 3.	287
PHTHARTOLATRÆ. Matt. i. 20. No. 2.	4
PIETISTS. Rev. xx. 4. No. 2.	504
PILLAR-SAINTS—STYLITE, or SANCTICOLUMNARES. 1 Cor.	
ix. 27. No. 3.	225
PNEUMATOMACHIANS. John vi. 7.	129
POLISH SOCINIANS. John iii. 13.	123
POPE, THE. Matt. xvi. 18. No. 2.	34
PRAXEAS. John xiv. 9. No. 1.	140
PRESBYTERIANS, Axton's quotation of the passage, Acts	
xiv. 23.	163
by whom the system was established. 1 Tim.	
iv. 14. No. 1.	377
their dispute with King Charles I. 1 Tim.	
iv. 14. No. 2.	378—389
PRISCILLIANISTS. 2 Cor. ii. 11. No. 3.	268
PSELLUS. Matt. xxv. 41. No. 1.	65
PURITANS, their objection to the observance of Lent. Matt.	
iv. 2. No. 1.	11
public Liturgy. Matt. vi. 7.	26
altars. 1 Cor. x. 21. No. 1.	228
the three ceremonies. 1 Cor. x. 23.	230
words in our burial service.	
1 Cor. xv. 21.	248
festivals. Gal. iv. 9. No. 1.	306
the English hierarchy. Philip.	
i. 1. No. 1.	349
bowing at the name of Jesus.	
Philip. ii. 10. No. 2.	352
QUAKERS, their arguments for rejecting the sacrament of the	
Lord's Supper. Matt. iii. 11. (P. 7.) Rev. iii.	
20. (P. 488.)	
Bap-	
tism. Matt. iii. 11. (P. 7.) xxviii. 19. No. 1.	
(P. 78.) John iii. 5. (P. 122.) Acts x. 47. (P.	
161.) 1 Cor. i. 17. (P. 213.) Gal. v. 6. (P. 312.)	
Eph. iv. 5. No. 10. (P. 337.) Heb. ix. 10.	
(P. 437.) 1 Pet. iii. 20. (P. 464.)	
refusing to take an oath. Matt.	
v. 33. No. 3. (P. 16.) Rom. ix. 1. (P. 202.)	
James v. 12. (P. 454.)	
not resisting evil. } Matt. v. 39.	
engaging in } No. 2.	19
war, &c.	
interpretation of the passage, Matt. xv. 8.	34
objection to titles, &c. Matt. xxxviii. 8.	
(P. 60.) 2 Tim. i. 13. (P. 400.)	

QUAKERS, their practice of waiting for the Holy Spirit.	Matt. xxvi. 41. No. 2. (P. 73.) 1 Cor. ii. 13. No. 2. (P. 216.) Gal. i. 1. No. 1. (P. 290.) 2 Pet. i. 21. (P. 467.)	
_____ peculiar mode of public worship.	John iv. 23.	125
_____ opinion concerning the influence of the Holy Spirit.	John vii. 39. (P. 133.) Rom. ii. 14. (P. 175.) Titus ii. 11. (P. 405.)	
_____ and custom relating to the ministry of women.	Acts ii. 17. (P. 153.) xxi. 9. (P. 170.) Rom. xvi. 1. (P. 209.) xvi. 12. (P. 211.)	
_____ objection to making provision for the clergy.	Acts xx. 33.	169
_____ rules relating to dress, public amusements, &c.	Rom. xii. 2. (P. 206.) 1 Pet. iii. 3. (P. 461.)	
_____ the ministry.	1 Cor. ii. 1. (P. 214.) xiv. 29. (P. 244.) Gal. i. 1. No. 1. (P. 291.)	
_____ opinion concerning the resurrection of the body.	1 Cor. xv. 40.	259
_____ observance of days, &c.	Gal. iv. 9. No. 2.	307
_____ objection to the commonly adopted names of days, months, &c.	2 Tim. i. 13.	400
_____ word Trinity.	1 John v. 7.	
No. 8.		483
on the expression "the word of God."	Heb. iv. 12.	427
QUIETISTS, their notions of a celestial light within them	Matt. xvii. 1.	49
_____ the efficacy	xxii. 37.	59
of contemplation		
RANTERS.	Matt. vii. 7.	27
REALISTS.	1 John v. 7. No. 2.	477
RELIEF KIRK, (MEMBERS OF).	1 Tim. iv. 14. No. 5.	390
RELLY, JAMES.	1 Cor. i. 23.	213
REMONSTRANTS.	Rom. v. 19. No. 4.	190
REYNOLDS.	2 Cor. vii. 11.	280
ROBINSON, JOHN.	1 Cor. xii. 5. No. 2.	235
ROMAN CATHOLICS, their translation of the passages,	Matt. iii. 2. (P. 7.) xix. 11. No. 1. (P. 51.) Luke xv. 10. (P. 100.) 1 Cor. ix. 5. (P. 224.) xi. 27. (P. 232.) Ephes. v. 32. No. 1. (P. 341.) Philip. iv. 3. No. 1. (P. 353.) Coloss. ii. 18. No. 1. (P. 364.) Heb. xi. 21. No. 1. (P. 442.)	
_____ interpretation of the passages,	Matt. xxvi. 27. (P. 71.) xxviii. 20. No. 1. (P. 80.) Luke xv. 10. (P. 100.) xvi. 9.	

22. (P. 101.)	John v. 39. (P. 128.)	
xiv. 16. (P. 143.)	xiv. 26. (P. 143.)	
xxi. 17. (P. 152.)	Rom. xi. 15. (P. 206.)	
1 Cor. xi. 10. (P. 232.)	xi. 28. (P. 233.)	
xi. 29. (P. 234.)	2 Cor. iii. 10. (P. 266.)	
Ephes. iv. 11. (P. 338.)	Coloss. ii. 18.	
No. 1. (P. 364.)	2 Thess. ii. 3. (P. 369.)	
ii. 15. (P. 370.)	1 Tim. ii. 5.	
No. 1. (P. 372.)	v. 12. (P. 390.)	
2 Tim. iii. 16.	No. 1. (P. 402.)	
James v. 14.	No. 1. (P. 455.)	
2 Pet. iii. 16.	No. 1. (P. 471.)	
1 John ii. 20. (P. 475.)	v. 16. (P. 485.)	
Rev. ii. 26. (P. 488.)		
ROMAN CATHOLICS, their doctrine concerning the	Luke i. 28.	
Virgin Mary	No. 1. (P. 92.)	
the fifteen mysteries to be me-	i. 48.	
ditated upon in saying the	Nos. 1, 2.	
rosary	3, 4. (P. 93.)	
the Confiteor		
their doctrine concerning the Pope, &c.		
Matt. xvi. 18.	Nos. 1, 2.	34
of transubstantiation	Matt.	
xxvi. 26.	No. 1. (P. 66.)	
1 Cor. xi.	29. (P. 234.)	
reason for denying the cup to the		
laity.	John vi. 53.	No. 1. 129
on purgatory, prayers	Matt. xii. 32.	
for the dead, indulgences,	Nos. 1, 2, 3.	
&c.	(P. 30, 31.)	
texts cited in favour of	xii. 36. (P. 33.)	
their doctrine	xiii. 19. No. 1.	
	(P. 42.)	
	2 Cor.	
	ii. 10. (P. 266.)	
	vi. 10. (P. 275.)	
	1 Pet. iii. 18.	
	No. 1. (P. 463.)	
on confession.	Matt. xvi. 19.	No. b.
(P. 42.)	James v. 16.	Nos. 1, 2. (P. 459.)
their arguments respecting miracles.		
John xiv. 12.		142
texts cited as authorities		
for suing for the prayers		
of the saints	Rom. xv. 30.	
extracts from their cate-	(P. 208.)	
chism with reference to	Rev.	
prayers addressed to	v. 8.	No. 1.
saints, &c.	(P. 490.)	

ROMAN CATHOLICS, their opinions concern-	Math. ix. 21.	
ing relics and images.	(P. 28.) Acts	
texts, &c.	xix. 12. (P.	
	165.) Heb. xi.	
	21. No. 1. (P.	
	442.) Rev. vi. 8.	
	No. 1. (P. 490.)	
their opinions concerning penance.	1 Cor.	
ix. 27. Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4.		224
on the vestments worn by their priests.		
Gal. v. 1. No. 2.		312
their practice of lay baptism.	Eph. ix. 5.	
No. 7.		335
seven sacraments.	Eph. v. 32.	
No. 1.		341
reason for making a reverence to		
the altar, &c.	Heb. xiii. 10. No. 2.	452
opinions relating to the voluntary		
renunciation of riches, the will, sensual		
and lawful pleasure.	Matt. xix. 21.	
No. 1.		52
the ceremony of the Host.	James v. 14.	
No. 3.		452
ROOT AND BRANCH PETITION.	1 Cor. xii. 5. No. 4.	236
RUSSIAN CHURCH, see GREEK CHURCH, their number of		
Lents, &c.	Matt. ix. 2. No. 2.	12
their mode of communicating.	Matt.	
xxvi. 26. No. 4.		68
the offices for the sanctification of the		
water, &c.	Mark i. 9. No. 2.	82
the Russian clergy.	1 Tim. iii. 2. No. 2.	375
SABBATARIANS.	Acts xviii. 4. No. 2.	165
SABEDDIUS.	John xiv. 9. No. 1.	140

* The Roman Catholics accuse Protestants of having corrupted the Scriptures in the following passages: Matt. xix. 11.; 1 Cor. vii. 9.; ix. 5.; xi. 27.; Gal. v. 17.; Heb. xi. 21. Owing to an error, their translation of 1 Cor. vii. 9. and Gal. v. 17. has not been inserted in the proper place.

1 Cor. vii. 9.

"But if they do not contain themselves, let them marry; for it is better to marry than to be burnt."—Roman Catholic Version.

"If they do not contain, &c. This is spoken of such as are free, and not of such as, by vow, have given their first faith to God; to whom, if they will use proper means to obtain it, God will never refuse the gift of continency. The Protestants have corrupted this text, by rendering it, if they cannot contain."

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

Gal. v. 17.

"For the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh: for these are contrary one to another; so that you do not the things that you would."

Roman Catholic Version.

	Page
SAMOSATENIANS. Heb. ii. 17. No. 2.	427
SANDEMAN, see GLASS.	
SATURNINUS. 2 Cor. ii. 11. No. 2.	267
SCHWENKFELDT. Matt. xxvi. 26. No. 9.	70
SCOT OF DUNSE. Matt. i. 24. No. 2.	5
SCOTCH CHURCH, and sects which have separated from it.	
1 Tim. iv. 14. Nos. 4, 5.	390
SCOTTISH BAPTISTS. Do. . No. 5.	ibid.
———, or NEW INDEPENDENTS. 1 Tim. iv. 14. No. 5.	ibid.
SECEDERS. Do. Do.	ibid.
SEEKERS. Matt. vii. 7.	27
SEMIARIANS, denominated Macedonians, or Pneumatoma-	
chians. John vi. 7.	129
——— in what manner they differed from the Arians.	
Heb. i. 2. No. 1.	412
SEPARATISTS. Heb. v. 4.	429
SERVETUS. 2 Cor. xiii. 14. No. 7.	289
SEVERUS. Rom. ix. 20.	204
SHAKERS, their belief with relation to miracles. Matt. x. 8.	28
——— a correspondence with	
spirits. 1 Cor. xii. 10. No. 2.	238
SIMON. Acts viii. 10.	159
SMECTYMNUUS, dispute with Bishop Hall. Acts iii. i.	156
——— explanation of the word— notion of a primitive	
Bishop, &c. 1 Tim. iv. 14. No. 2.	378
SOCINUS AND SOCINIANS, their sentiments concerning Christ.	
John xiv. 28. No. 4.	145
——— the Holy	
Ghost. 2 Cor. xiii. 14. No. 5.	288
——— baptism.	
Eph. iv. 5. No. 9.	337
——— the Scrip-	
tures. 2 Tim. iii. 16. No. 2.	403
——— opinion of Socinus relating to wor-	
ship. Heb. iv. 15. (P. 428.)	
present practice of the Socinians.	
1 Tim. ii. 8. (P. 374.)	
SOLIFIDIANS. Rom. v. 1. No. 2.	181
STORK. 1 Cor. iii. 19.	217
STUDITE. Matt. xxvi. 41. No. 1.	72
SUB AND SUPRALAPSARIANS. 1 Cor. xv. 22. No. 2.	249
SWADDLERS. Luke ii. 12.	96
SWEDENBORG AND SWEDENBORGIANS, their theory respecting	
the "one God." 1 Cor. viii. 4. (P. 223.)	
Coloss. ii. 9. No. 2. (P. 361.)	
——— angels.	
1 Cor. xii. 10. No. 1.	238
——— the spi-	
ritual world. 1 Cor. xv. 44. No. 2.	260

SWEDENBORG AND SWEDENBORGIANS, their theory respecting the Scriptures. Eph. vi. 19. No. 5.	348
_____ a Tri-	
_____ nity. 1 John v. 7. No. 6.	481
_____ their mode of worship.	
_____ 1 Tim. ii. 8.	374
SYNERGISTS. Eph. ii. 9.	328
TALMUD, THE, and the Thirteen Articles of the Jewish Religion. Gal. i. 14. Nos. 1, 2.	295—302
TATIAN, practice of his disciples at the Lord's Supper. Matt. xxvi. 26. No. 6.	69
_____ his tenets. Gal. vi. 8. No. 1.	313
THEODOTUS. Heb. v. 6. No. 1.	430
THEOSOPHISTS. 1 Cor. ii. 13. No. 1.	215
TRITHEISTS. 1 John v. 7. No. 1.	477
TUNKERS, or TUMBLERS. See DUNKERS. Ephes. iv. 5. No. 11.	338
UNITARIANS. <i>Passim.</i>	
UNIVERSALISTS. Rev. xx. 6.	505
WALDENSES, their sentiments respecting oaths, war, &c. Matt. v. 32. No. 2. (P. 16.) v. 39. No. 1. (P. 18.)	
WALTER. Rev. xii. 7. No. 1.	496
WATCHERS. Matt. xxvi. 41. No. 1.	72
WESLEY, his sentiments concerning diabolical agency and unholy spirits. Matt. iv. 24. No. 1. (P. 12.) Luke xvi. 22. No. 6. (P. 103.)	
_____ the sudden change wrought in the minds of men. Acts xxvi. 18. No. 1.	171
_____ faith. Matt. xxi. 22. (P. 58.) Rom. v. 1. No. 3. (P. 182.) Ephes. i. 13. (P. 316.)	
_____ the duration of Judgment. 2 Cor. v. 10. No. 3.	274
_____ a change of preachers. Philip. i. 1. No. 2.	349
_____ doctrine of perfection. Matt. v. 48. No. 2.	25
_____ description of their love-feasts. Acts ii. 46.	155
_____ "the witness of the Spirit." Rom. viii. 16.	196
_____ the manner in which he was "born of God." 1 John iii. 9.	475
_____ occurrences during prayer-time, &c. Acts iv. 30. (P. 157.) 1 Tim. ii. 6. No. 1. (P. 373.)	
_____ differed from Whitefield. Rom. viii. 33. No. 3.	201
_____ regulations for attending upon the sick. Rom. xvi. 1. No. 3.	211

	Page
WESLEY, Charles, his sentiments respecting the ministry of angels. 1 Cor. xii. 10. No. 3.	238
———— John, his practice of giving tickets, &c. 2 Cor. iii. 1.	269
———— sanctioned the practice of day-preaching. Gal. i. 1. No. 2.	293
———— his interpretation of the passage, Eph. iv. 15.	339
———— breach between him and the Moravians. Coloss. iii. 20.	366
———— rules of the bands. James v. 16. No. 3.	453
WHITFIELD, introduced the practice of field-preaching. Matt. v. 1. (P. 13.) John vii. 38. (P. 132.)	
———— adopted Calvin's doctrine of election, &c. Rom. viii. 33. No. 3. (P. 201.) ix. 21. (P. 205.)	
XENAIAS. 1 Pet. iv. 1. No. 2.	466
ZINZENDORF, his doctrine. Rom. iv. 5. (P. 179.) v. 1. No. 4. (P. 182.)	
———— decision relating to the separation from the Lutheran church. 2 Thess. ii. 15. No. 2.	370
———— application of the passage to his own followers. Rev. xiv. 1.	497
ZUINGLE. Matt. xxvi. 26. No. 8.	70
<hr/>	
A Refutation of Unitarianism	509
The Church of England	547
A summary of the principal errors detailed in this volume, and a refutation of them, by texts which support the tenets of the Church of England	549

ST. MATTHEW.

MATTHEW i. 17, 18.

“ So all the generations, &c. Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise,” &c.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ THE remainder of this chapter and the whole of the second are of doubtful authority. They are, indeed, to be found in all the manuscripts and versions which are now extant, but from the direct testimony of Epiphanius, and indirectly from that of Jerome (see Pope, on Mir. Concept. p. 93.) we learn that they were wanting in the copies used by the Nazarenes and the Ebionites, that is, by the ancient Hebrew Christians; for whose instruction, probably, the Gospel of Matthew was originally written; and to whom the account of the conception of Jesus Christ could not have been unacceptable, if it had been found in the genuine narrative. Nor would it at all have militated against the doctrine of the proper Humanity of Christ, which was universally held by the Jewish Christians, it being a fact analogous to the miraculous birth of Isaac, Samuel, and other eminent persons of the Hebrew Nation.

“ The objection, so much insisted upon, that the authority of the Ebionites is to be admitted *indiscriminately*, because their testimony is appealed to in a *particular case*, is trifling in the extreme. Further, if it be true, as Luke relates, chap. iii. 23, that Jesus was entering upon his thirtieth year, (see Wakefield’s translation) in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius, he must have been born two years at least after the death of Herod, a circumstance which alone invalidates the whole story. See Lardner’s works, vol. i. p. 432. It is indeed highly improbable that no notice should have been taken of these extraordinary events by any contemporary writer, that no expectation should have been excited by them, and that no allusion should have been made to them in any other passage of the sacred writings. Some of the facts have a fabulous appearance, and the reasoning from the prophecies of the Old Testament is inconclusive. Also, if this account be true, the proper name of Jesus, according to the uniform custom of the Jews, would have been Jesus of Bethlehem, not Jesus of Nazareth. Our Lord in the Gospels is repeatedly spoken of as the son of Joseph, without any intimation, on the part of the historian that this language is incorrect. See Matt. xiii. 55; Luke iv. 23; John i. 45, vi. 42. The account of the miraculous conception of Jesus was probably the fiction of some early Gentile Convert, who hoped, by elevating the dignity of the Founder, to abate the popular prejudice against the sect. See upon this subject, Dr. Priestley’s History of Early Opinions, vol. iv. b. iii. c. 20. Pope, on the Miraculous Conception; Dr. Williams’ Free Enquiry: Dr. Bell’s Arguments for the Authenticity of the Narratives of

Matthew and Luke, and Dr. Williams' Remarks; Dr. Campbell and Dr. Newcome's notes upon the text; Mr. Evanson's Dissonance, chap. i. sect. 3, chap. iii. sect. 2; Jones's Developement of Events, vol. i. p. 365, &c.; Sequel to Ecclesiastical Researches, p. i. chap. 7, 8."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

MATTHEW i. 20.

"That which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost."

No. 1.

(APOLLINARIS.)

Apollinaris, who lived in the fourth century, defended strenuously the Divinity of Christ against the Arians, but by indulging himself too freely in philosophical distinctions and subtleties, he was carried so far, as to deny, in some measure, his *humanity*.

He maintained, that the body which Christ assumed, was endowed with a *sensitive* and not a *rational* soul; and that the Divine Nature performed the functions of reason and supplied the place of what we call the *mind*, the spiritual and intellectual principle in man.

Many of the followers of Apollinaris refined upon this, and affirmed, that one nature only existed in Jesus Christ, and that the flesh was of the same nature with the divinity. Others affirmed that Jesus Christ had taken his body from heaven, and that it was impassive and immortal; and his birth, passion, death, burial, and resurrection, only illusive appearances.

Apollinaris has been accused of asserting, that the Divinity suffered and died, &c., but these sentiments are rather consequences drawn from the principles of Apollinaris, than the sentiments of that Bishop.

See Bayle's Dict. Art. Apollinaris; Mosheim and Gregory.

No. 2.

(JULIAN.)

At the commencement of the sixth century, Julian, Bishop of Halicarnassus, and Caianus of Alexandria, maintained, that the divine nature of Christ insinuated itself into the human in the conception thereof, changed its condition and rendered it incorruptible. They, and their followers, were called Caianists, Aphthartodocetæ, Phantasiasts, &c., as it was imagined their hypothesis inferred, that Christ had not a true manhood.

Severus of Antioch, and his party maintained, that Christ's body was corruptible of itself, but by reason of the Godhead dwelling in it, was never corrupted. Their enemies called them Phthartolatræ, Ktistolatræ, and Creaticolæ, i. e. Corruption Worshippers, Creature Worshippers, and Flesh Worshippers.

See Asseman. Biblioth. Orient. tom. iii. part 2, p. 457.

No. 3.

(MENNO.)

The rigid Mennonites adopted the fancy of Menno, that our Saviour's body was not formed of the substance of the Virgin, but was brought from heaven, or created by the Holy Ghost.

(See Note to Ephes. iv. 5.)



MATTHEW i. 24.*"And took unto him his wife."***No. 1. (ANTIDICOMARIANITES AND COLLYRIDIAN.)**

Towards the close of the fourth century two opposite sects involved Arabia and the adjacent countries in a new controversy. These jarring factions went by the names of Antidicomarianites and Collyridians.

The former maintained, that the Virgin Mary did not always preserve her immaculate state. The latter, on the contrary, who were singularly favoured by the female sex, running into the opposite extreme, worshipped the blessed Virgin as a Goddess, and judged it necessary to appease her anger and seek her favour and protection by libations, sacrifices, and oblations of Cakes (*Collyridæ*) and such like services.

See Epiphan. Hæres. 78, 79. p. 1008, 1057.

No. 2. (SCOT OF DUNSE.)

In the fourteenth century, John Scot of Dunse, acquired much fame by attempting to demonstrate the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, in opposition to the opinion of Montesono, the Dominican Professor of Divinity at Paris. Some years being spent in furious dispute, the University condemned Montesono's opinion and adopted that of Scot.

See Waddingus, Annal. Minor. tom. vi. p. 52.

No. 3. (FESTIVAL OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.)

Sixtus 4th, in the year 1476, granted indulgences by an express and particular edict to all those who

should devoutly celebrate an annual festival in honour of the immaculate conception of the blessed Virgin, with respect to which none of the Popes before him had thought proper to make any express declaration, or any positive appointment.

See Raph. Volaterrani Comment. Urbani, lib. 8. f. 289. Cæneas Silvius de statu Europæ sub Frederico 3 cap. 10. in Freheri Scriptor. Rerum Germanicar. tom. ii. p. 104.

No. 4. (FEAST OF THE SINLESS CONCEPTION.)

In 1709 Clement the Eleventh appointed the "*Feast of the sinless Conception*," to be observed in the whole Romish Church. It is well known that great vexation had been caused to the pontiffs by the ancient debate between the followers of Francis and Dominic concerning the sinless conception of Mary.

Brown's History of the Christian Church.

MATTHEW ii. 23.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"He shall be called a Nazarene."

(See Note to Luke ii. 22.)

MATTHEW iii. 1.

(EBIONITES.)

"The Gospel of the Ebionites or Hebrews, which did not contain the account of the miraculous conception of Jesus, began in this manner: "It came to pass in the days of Herod the king of Judea, that

John came baptizing with the baptism of repentance in the river Jordan."

See Epiphanius Hæres, 80. sect. 13.

MATTHEW iii. 2.

"Repent ye." (Do penance.—Roman Catholic Version.)

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

"Do penance—pœnitentiam agite—μετανοείτε. Which word, according to the use of the Scriptures and the Holy Fathers, does not only signify repentance and amendment of life, but also punishing past sins by fasting and such like penitential exercises."

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

MATTHEW iii. 11.

"I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance, but he that cometh after me, shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire."

(QUAKERS.)

The Quakers* do not observe either the Sacrament of Baptism, or of the Lord's Supper. They

* It was in the year 1650 (says Neal), that they received the denomination of Quakers upon this occasion. Their speaking to the people was usually attended with convulsive agitations and shakings of the body. All their speakers had these tremblings, and they gloried in asserting it to be the character of a good man to tremble before God. When George Fox appeared before Jervas Bennet, Esq., one of the justices of Derby, Oct. 30, 1650, he had one of his agitations or fits of trembling upon him, and with a loud voice and vehement emotion of body, bade the justice and those about him tremble at the word of the Lord. Whereupon the justice gave him and his friends the name of Quakers, which being agreeable to their common behaviour, quickly became the distinguishing character of the people.—*Neal's History of the Puritans.*

regard all religious observances as local and temporary, and urge that we may as well continue the custom of washing each other's feet as baptize after the example of John.

It is contended by one of their advocates that baptism with water was in some degree in use under the Jewish law, and occasionally both added to circumcision and substituted for it, in the admission of proselytes. Hence, and by the practice of John, this custom was introduced into the Christian Church, as the mode of acknowledging its converts; but the Quakers conceive it to be no more an essential part of Christianity than other Jewish ceremonies for a time practised by the early Christians.

"It is clear," says Mr. Tuke, "that John considered his dispensation and baptism as only temporary; nor does he, as a substitute for his baptism, refer his disciples to any other baptism with water, to be instituted by Christ. On the contrary, he plainly shews, that the baptism which was to supersede his, was to be of a different and spiritual nature, as appears by the words, 'I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance, but he that cometh after me, shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.'"

Mr. Gurney says, "I am informed that in some parts of the Continent of Europe, there are small societies of pious Christians by whom water baptism and the ceremony of the Lord's Supper are entirely disused. This is the case, as I understand, with the Inspire's in Germany, and with the Malakans in South Russia; and that such is the fact in the society of Friends is very generally understood.

"It is our belief, that we have been led out of

the practice of these rites by the Spirit of Truth; that we could not recur to them without grieving our heavenly monitor; and that in fact they are not in accordance with the entire spirituality of the Gospel dispensation."

Mr. Gurney adds, "One thing is described, as Grotius observes, by two different modes of expression—an observation, which derives confirmation from Mark i. 8. in which passage the baptism attributed to Christ is that of the Holy Ghost alone. The other declaration made by the Baptist to the same effect is related by the apostle John as follows, 'And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him, and I knew him not; but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost; and I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God,' ch. i. 32—34. Such is the contrast drawn by John between his own baptism and the baptism of Christ. The one is with water, and merely external; the other is with the Spirit and fire, internal and powerful. The one is the work of man, and like the minister who practised it, is 'of the earth, earthly;' the other is divine, the work of the eternal Son of God, who came from heaven, and is 'above all.' John iii. 31.

"Such is the view taken of fiery baptism, here mentioned, by many learned and able critics; for example, Munster, Erasmus, Vatablus, Lud, Cappelus, Calvin, Grotius. See Critic. Sacr. in loc. An excellent exposition of Matt. iii. 11. will be found in the well known and justly valued Commentaries of the late Thomas Scott."

Some of the texts quoted by the Quakers in justification of their disuse of baptism, are the following:—1 Cor. i. 17. Heb. vii. 18. Gal. iv. 9. Coloss. ii. 20. Ephes. ii. 14, 15.

(See Note to Matt. xxviii. 19.)

MATTHEW iv. 1.

“ Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness, to be tempted of the devil.”

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ This form of expression denotes that the historian is about to describe a visionary scene, and not a real event. See Rev. i. 10. Acts xi. 5. Our Lord was intrusted with the power of working miracles at pleasure, John iii. 34, 35.; and by the visionary scene presented to his mind on this occasion, he was instructed that he was not to exert his miraculous powers for his own personal advantage or aggrandizement, but solely in subservience to the great design of his mission and ministry. See Farmer on Christ’s temptation. Some have thought that the account of the temptation is a figurative description of the train of thoughts which passed through the mind of Jesus. See Cappe’s Dissertation. The introduction of the devil into this scenical representation, no more proves the real existence of such a being, than the introduction of the lamb, or the red dragon, in the apocalyptic vision, is a proof of the real existence of those symbolical agents.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

MATTHEW iv. 2.

"Fasted forty days."

No. 1.

(PURITANS.)

The Puritans contended that the observation of Lent, in imitation of Jesus Christ, is superstitious.

See Neal's History of the Puritans.

No. 2.

(RUSSIAN CHURCH.)

The Russians, with their mother church, have four Lents annually, besides a great number of other abstinences or fasts, and Wednesdays and Fridays, which are fish-days throughout the whole year. The first Lent comprehends the forty days previous to Christmas; the second, which is their great Lent, the same space of time before Easter; the third, called the Lent of St. Peter, commences the week after Pentecost, or Whitsunday, and ends on the feast of St. Peter (June 29.); and the fourth, the Lent of the Mother of God, begins on the first, and ends on the fifteenth of August; this last being the day of Koimesis, or the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin.

They eat neither meat, nor eggs, nor drink milk, during Lent; linseed oil, fish, herbs, roots, and mushrooms, are then their sole nourishment.

Secret Memoirs, Vol. II. p. 87.

(See Note to Gal. iv. 9.)

MATTHEW iv. 11.

"Angels came and ministered."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"i. e. He received peculiar divine aid, expressed in Jewish language. SIMPSON."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

MATTHEW iv. 24.

"Possessed with devils."

No. 1.

(WESLEY.)

Wesley maintained, that madness was frequently occasioned by demoniacal possession, and in this opinion he found many to encourage him. At one time, his prayers were desired for a child that was a lunatic, and sore vexed day and night; that our Lord might be pleased to heal him, as he did those in the days of his flesh.

Wesley's notions of diabolical agency went very far; he imputed to it many of the accidents and discomforts of life; disease, bodily hurts, storms and earthquakes, and nightmare; he believed that epilepsy was often, or always, the effect of possession, and that most madmen were demoniacs.

Southey's Life of Wesley.

No. 2.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"Insane and epileptic persons were supposed to be possessed by demons, or the ghosts of wicked men, who were thought to have the power of entering

into the bodies of living men, and of tormenting them at pleasure. And the cure of these diseases is described as the casting out of the demons. The account which the Gospel reveals of the state of the dead is so inconsistent with this hypothesis, that it was soon exploded among Christians. But, that lunatics and epileptics were possessed by devils, or fallen angels, though it is an opinion which prevailed early, is no where asserted, nor even hinted at, in the New Testament, and is totally destitute of foundation, both in reason and revelation. See Farmer's *Essay on the Demoniacs of the New Testament.*"

Note to the Unitarian Version.

MATTHEW v. 1, 2.

"He went up into a mountain and taught," &c.

(WHITEFIELD AND WESLEY.)

On the 13th Feb. 1739, Whitefield stood upon a mountain in a place called Rose Green, his first "field pulpit," and preached to as many as came to hear, attracted by the novelty of such an address.

"I thought," said he, "it might be doing the service of my Creator, who had a mountain for his pulpit, and the heavens for a sounding-board; and who, when his Gospel was refused by the Jews, sent his servants into the highways and hedges." Wesley followed the example of Whitefield.

"I could scarcely reconcile myself at first," said Wesley, "to this strange way, having been all my life, till very lately, so tenacious of every point relating to decency and order, that I should have thought the saving of souls almost a sin, if it had not been done in a church."

The next day he observed, “ that our Lord’s Sermon on the Mount was one pretty instance of field preaching,” and, he adds, “ I suppose there were churches at that time also.” “ On the morrow, at four in the afternoon,” he says, “ I submitted to be more vile, and proclaimed on the highways the glad tidings of salvation, speaking from a little eminence in a ground adjoining the city, to about three thousand people.”

Southey’s Life of Wesley.

MATTHEW v. 17.

“ Think not that I am come to destroy the law.”

(PASAGINIANS OR PASAGII.)

The Pasaginians, an Italian sect of the twelfth century, affirmed, that the law of Moses was obligatory upon Christians in every thing except the offering of sacrifices; in consequence of which, they circumcised their followers, abstained from those meats, the use of which was prohibited under the Mosaic Economy, and celebrated the Jewish Sabbath.—They denied the Divinity of Christ.

Dr. Mosheim observes, that the origin of the name Pasagini, or Pasagii, is not known; but it appears, from other writers, that it is derived from the Greek words *πας* and *αγιος* all holy; and that the name of Pasaginians was assumed by different fanatics, who pretended to particular sanctity.

See Dictionn. des Hérésies.

MATTHEW v. 25, 26.

“ *Agree with thine adversary quickly, whilst thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge.*”

(CARPOCRATES.)

The followers of Carpocrates regarded angels as adversaries, who delighted in beholding men sunk in pleasure and debauchery.

These sectarians are said to have asserted, that an indulgence in the basest and most vicious pleasures, was a species of contribution which the soul owed to angels; and on this account the most infamous deeds became acts of virtue. They pretended, that in this conduct, they were conforming to the words of St. Matthew, v. 25.

Carpocrates himself taught, that the soul could not be purified till it had committed all kinds of abominations, making that a necessary condition of perfection.

The impious tenets of this man were calculated to destroy all virtue.

See Clem. Alex. l. iii. Strom. p. 812. Philastr. de Hær. Iræn. l. i. c. 24. Euseb. l. iv. c. 7. Hist. Eccles. Epiph. Hær. 27.



MATTHEW v. 33—37.

“ *Swear not at all,*” &c.

No. 1.

(ANABAPTISTS OR MENNONITES.)

The Anabaptists, or Mennonites, maintained the same tenets with regard to oaths, &c. as are now held by the Quakers, and detailed in the following page.

(See Note to Ephes. iv. 5.)

No. 2.

(WALDENSES.)

In the society of the Waldenses, oaths of all kinds were prohibited.

See the Codex Inquisitionis Tolosonæ, published by Limborch, as also the Summa Monetæ contra Waldenses.

No. 3.

(QUAKERS.)

From the words contained in these verses, and also James v. 12. the Quakers consider themselves bound to decline taking an oath under any circumstances.

The following extracts are taken from Mr. Gurney's "Observations on the Religious Peculiarities of the Society of Friends."

"Friends, in accordance, as I understand, with the Moravians, consider it their bounden duty to avoid swearing of every description, and on every occasion. Such a line of conduct they deem to be both justified and required; *first*, by certain plain moral principles; and, *secondly*, by divine commands of the most impressive and comprehensive character. Epictetus says, *παράλτρησαι ὄρκον εἰς ἅπαν*, 'avoid swearing altogether.' Plato, *ὄρκος περὶ παντός ἀπέστω*, 'let oaths be avoided on every occasion.' Chærilus, *ὄρκον δὲ φεύγε καὶ δικαίως ὀμνύης*, 'abstain from swearing even though it be justly.' Stobæus, Serm. 3, relates, that Solon said, 'a good man ought to be in that situation that he need not an oath; because it is to be reputed a lessening of his honour if he be forced to swear.' Pythagoras, in his oration, among other things, hath this maxim, as that which concerns the administration of the Commonwealth, 'Let no man call God to witness by an

Oath, no not in judgment; but let every man so accustom himself to speak, that he may become worthy to be trusted even without an oath.'—Barclay's Apology, Prop. xv. §. 12.

“ ‘ I say nothing of perjury,’ says Tertullian, ‘ since swearing itself is unlawful to Christians.’ De Idol. cap. 11. ed. Semler. tom. iv. 161. ‘ The old law,’ says Basil, ‘ is satisfied with the honest keeping of the oath; but Christ cuts off the opportunity of perjury, by forbidding us to swear; for where there is no oath, there can be no infringement of it.’ In Cant. Hom. 13. ed. Ben. tom. i. 657-8. ‘ Let the Christian entirely avoid oaths, in obedience to our Lord’s prohibition,’ exclaims Chrysostom; ‘ do not therefore say to me, I swear for a just purpose. It is no longer lawful for thee to swear, either justly or unjustly. Let us preserve our mouths free from an oath.’ In Gen. 2. Hom. 15. ed. Ben. tom. iv. p. 122.

“ ‘ It is our absolute duty,’ says Gregory Nazianzen, ‘ strictly to attend to the commands of our king, and by all means to avoid an oath, especially such an one as is taken in the name of God.’ Orat. 53. ed. Colon, A. D. 1690. tom. i. p. 760. See also Justin, Apol. I. cap. 16. ed. Ben. p. 53. Clement. Alex. Pæd. lib. iii. ed. Ben. p. 29. Strom. lib. v. p. 707. Origen in Com. Matt. serie, tract. 23. ed. Ben. tom. iii. p. 842. Cyprian, Testim. lib. iii. §. 12. Hilary Episc. in M. v. 34. ed. Ben. p. 628. Theophylact. in Matt. v. 33. Ambrose in Ps. 118. Expos. 14. ed. Ben. tom. i. p. 1145. Jerom. in Matt. ver. 34. Isidorus Pelus, lib. i. ep. 155. Barclay’s Apology, Prop. xv. §. 12.”

(See Note to James v. 12.)

No. 4.

(PURITANS.)

During the Commonwealth in England, it was ordained, June 28, 1650, that every nobleman who shall be convicted of profane cursing and swearing by the oath of one or more witnesses, or by his own confession, shall pay, for the first offence, thirty shillings to the poor of the parish; a baronet or knight, twenty shillings; an esquire, six shillings and eight-pence; and all inferior persons, three shillings and four-pence. For the second offence, they are to pay double, according to their qualities above mentioned. And for the tenth offence, they are to be judged common swearers and cursers, and to be bound over to their good behaviour for three years.

The like punishment for women; whose fines are to be determined according to their own or to their husband's quality.

Neal's History of the Puritans.

—

MATTHEW v. 39.

“*Resist not evil.*”

No. 1.

(WALDENSES.)

The Waldenses, so famous in history, and among whom, as Dr. Maclaine observes, the Protestant religion may be said to have dwelt before the time of Luther, adopted, as the model of their moral discipline, the Sermon of Christ on the Mount, which they interpreted and explained in the most rigorous and literal manner, and consequently prohibited and condemned in their society all wars and suits of law, all attempts towards the acquisition of wealth —

the inflicting of capital punishments and self-defence against unjust violence.

See the Codex Inquisitionis Tolosonæ, published by Limborch, as also the Summa Monetæ contra Waldenses, and the other writers of the Waldensian history.

No. 2.

(QUAKERS.)

One of the peculiar tenets of the Quakers is that of abstaining from war under every species of provocation.

The following extracts are from Gurney's "Observations," &c.

"The man who engages in warfare retains his private responsibility; and whatever may be the proceedings of his countrymen, whatever the commands of his superiors, he can never dispossess himself of his individual obligation to render to the law of his God a consistent and uniform obedience. But, secondly, the unlawfulness of war, under any of its forms, is equally evident, when it is regarded as the affair of nations. Doubtless there may be found in the Scriptures a variety of injunctions relating to the particulars of human conduct, and applicable to men and women only as individuals; but it is one of the excellent characteristics of the moral law of God, that its principles are of universal application to mankind, whatever be the circumstances under which they are placed; whether they act singly as individuals, or collectively as nations. No one, surely, who has any just views of morality, will pretend for a moment, that those fundamental rules of conduct which are given to guide every man in his own walk through life, may be deserted as soon as he unites with others and acts in a corporate

society. The absurd consequence of such a system would be manifestly this; that national crimes of every description might be committed without entailing any national guilt, and without any real infraction of the revealed will of God.

“ I have farther to remark, that the doctrine of the Society of Friends respecting the absolute inconsistency of warfare with the moral code of the Christian Dispensation, was one which prevailed to a very considerable extent during the early ages of the Christian Church. Justin Martyr, (A. D. 140.) in his first Apology, quotes the prophecy of Isaiah respecting the going forth of the law and of the Word of God from Jerusalem, and the consequent prevalence of a state of peace. ‘ That these things have come to pass,’ he proceeds, ‘ you may be readily convinced; for twelve men, destitute both of instruction and eloquence, went forth from Jerusalem into the world, and by the power of God gave evidence to every description of persons, that they were sent by Christ to teach all men the divine word; and we who were once slayers of one another, (that is to say, commonly engaged in warfare) do not fight against our enemies.’ Apol. I. cap. xxxix. p. 67. ed. Ben. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, (A. D. 167.) discusses the same prophecy, and proves its relation to our Saviour, by the fact that the followers of Jesus had disused the weapons of war, and no longer knew how to fight. Adv. Hær. lib. iv. cap. 34. ed. Ben. p. 275. Tertullian, (A. D. 200.) in one part of his works, alludes to Christians who were engaged together with their heathen countrymen in military pursuits; Apol. cap. xlii. ed. Semler. v. 102.; but on another occasion he informs us that many soldiers who had been

converted to Christianity, quitted those pursuits in consequence of their conversion; and he repeatedly expresses his own opinion that any participation in war was unlawful for believers in Jesus, not only because of the idolatrous practices enjoined on the soldiers of the Roman armies, but because Christ had forbidden the use of the sword, and the revenge of injuries; De Idol. 19. ed. Semler 4. 176. De Coron. Mil. 12. iv. 355. Origen (A. D. 230.) in his work against Celsus, says of himself and his brethren, 'We no longer take up the sword against any nation, nor do we learn more to make war. We have become, for the sake of Jesus, the children of peace.' Lib. v. 33. ed. Ben. i. 602. In another passage of the same work he maintains, that Christians are the most useful of subjects because they pray for their monarch. 'By such means,' says he, 'we fight for our king abundantly: but we take no part in his wars, even though he urge us.' Lib. viii. 73. ed. Ben. i. 797. Here we have not only the declarations of this ancient and eminent Father of his own sentiment, that war is inconsistent with the religion of Christ, but a plain testimony (corresponding with that of Justin and Irenæus) that the Christians of those early times were accustomed to abstain from it. Traces of the same doctrine and practice are very clearly marked in the subsequent history of the church. Under the reign of Dioclesian (A. D. 300.) more especially, a large number of Christians refused to serve in the army, and in consequence of their refusal, many of them suffered martyrdom; vide Grot. de Jure Bell. lib. i. cap. 2, 3. 8. Ruinart Acta Martyrum; de S. Maximiliano, ed. Amst. p. 300. Now although the conduct of these Christians might partly arise, as Grotius suggests, from their

religious objection to the idolatrous rites at that time mixed up with the military system, it is probable that the unlawfulness of war itself for the followers of Christ, was also a principle on which they acted. Thus Lactantius, who wrote during the reign of this very emperor, expressly asserts that 'to engage in war cannot be lawful for the righteous man, whose warfare is that of righteousness itself.' *De vero cultu*, lib. vi. cap. 20. And again, in the twelfth canon of the Council of Nice, held under the reign of Constantine, (A. D. 325.) a long period of excommunication is attached, as a penalty, to the conduct of those persons, who, having once in the ardour of their early faith renounced the military calling, were persuaded, by the force of bribes, to return to it—'like dogs to their own vomit.' *Vide Manseii. Col. Concil*, tom. ii. p. 674. The circumstances particularly alluded to in this canon, might indeed have taken place during the tyranny of the idolatrous Licinius, whom Constantine had so lately subdued; but the canon itself was, I presume, intended for the future regulation of the church; and such a law would scarcely have been promulgated under the reign of the converted Constantine, had not an opinion been entertained in the council, that war itself, however prevalent and generally allowed, was inconsistent with the highest standard of Christian morality. We have already noticed the declaration of Martin, addressed to the Emperor Justin, (A. D. 360.) that it was unlawful for him to fight, because he was a Christian; and even so late as the middle of the fifth century, Leo, the Pope, declared it to be 'contrary to the rules of the church, that persons after the action of penance (persons then considered to be pre-eminently bound to obey the

law of Christ) should revert to the warfare of the world.' Epist. ii.

"It is evident, that the principle now stated applies to the punishment of death as well as to war. The use of such a punishment was, indeed, consistent with that inferior degree of moral and religious light, which was enjoyed by the people of God before the coming of the Messiah; but on the ground now mentioned, it appears to be at total variance with the characteristic of the Christian Revelation. Such was the opinion of some of the early fathers of the church, as well as of mere philanthropists. Tertullian classes a participation in capital condemnations with the aiding and abetting of idolatry itself; for in his works we find him reasoning on the possible innocence of a war, *cui non sit necessitas immolationum* (of sacrifices to idols) *vel capitalium judiciorum*; De Idol. 19. So also Lactantius; 'It is unlawful for a righteous man to prosecute any person capitally; for it matters not whether we kill by the sword or by the word; since all killing is prohibited. This divine law allows of no exception. It must ever be a forbidden wickedness to put a man to death; for God has created him a sacred animal.' De vero cultu, lib. vi. cap. 20."

On the subject of the inexpediency of capital punishments, and of their practical inconsistency with the present condition of the British population, the reader is referred to the speech of Thomas Fowell Buxton, delivered in the House of Commons during the Sessions of 1821, and since published.

No. 3.

(DUNKERS.)

The Dunkers never allow any lawsuit. One may cheat, rob, and abuse them without ever being ex-

posed to any retaliation, or even to any complaint from them. Religion seems to have the same effect upon them that philosophy had upon the Stoics, making them insensible to every kind of insult ; and hence they are sometimes called the harmless Dunkers.

See the Letters of Caspini, p. 70.

MATTHEW v. 48.

"Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father," &c.

No. 1.

(PELAGIUS.)

The Pelagians, who advocate the possibility of arriving at perfection, say, that it is clearly and frequently prescribed in the Sacred Writings.

If we cannot fulfil this obligation of being perfect, they contend, He who prescribed it, either was not acquainted with human weakness, or is unjust in punishing us for noncompliance. Pelag. Ep. ad Demetriad. apud Hyeron, tom. iv. p. 19.

To reduce the question to more precise terms, said the Pelagians, it is necessary to ask those who pretend that man cannot live without sin,

1. What is sin? Can it be avoided or not? If we cannot avoid it, there is no harm in committing it; and neither reason nor justice permit us to call that *sin*, which cannot by any means be avoided. But if man can avoid sin, he can then remain all his life without it:

2. It is necessary to ask them, if man ought to be without sin: they will answer, without doubt, that he ought; but if he ought, he can; and if he cannot, he ought not.

If man ought not to be without sin, he ought to

be a sinner ; and it will be no longer his fault, if it be supposed that he is so necessarily.

3. If man cannot be free from sin, it is either from the necessity of his nature, or by the free choice of his will, that he sins. If it be from the necessity of his nature, he is no longer culpable, in fact he does not sin ; if it be by the free choice of his own will, he may then avoid sin all his life.

See Dictionn. des Hérésies.

No. 2.

(WESLEY.)

One of the favorite doctrines of Wesley, in which Whitefield did not acquiesce, was that of perfection.

The following are extracts from the writings of Wesley and Fletcher.

“ Q. What is implied in being a *perfect Christian* ?

“ A. The loving the Lord our God with all our heart, and with all our mind, and soul, and strength. Deut. vi. 5. xxx. 6. Ezek. xxxvi. 25. 29.

“ Q. Does this imply that all inward sin is taken away ?

“ A. Without doubt ; or how could he be said to be saved from *all his uncleanness*.

“ Q. What commands are there to this effect ?

“ A. Matt. v. 48. Be ye perfect, &c. Matt. xxii. 37. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, &c. But if the love of God fill all the heart, there can be no sin there.”

Mr. Wesley said, “ To explain myself a little farther on this head : 1. Not only *sin, properly so called*, that is, a *voluntary* transgression of a known law ; but *sin, improperly so called*, that is, an *involuntary* transgression of a divine law, known or un-

known, needs the atoning blood. 2. I believe there is no such perfection in this life as excludes these *involuntary* transgressions, which I apprehend to be naturally consequent on the ignorance and mistakes inseparable from mortality. 3. Therefore, *sinless perfection* is a phrase I never use, lest I should seem to contradict myself. 4. I believe a person filled with the love of God is still liable to these involuntary transgressions. 5. Such transgressions you may call sins, if you please : I do not."

See Mr. Wesley's Plain Account of Christian Perfection, p. 60. See also Wesley's and Fletcher's Works; Benson's Apology for the Methodists; and Myles's Chronological History of the Methodists.

MATTHEW vi. 7.

"When ye pray, use not vain repetitions."

(PURITANS.)

The Puritans said, they objected to some things in the public Liturgy established by law; as the frequent repetition of the Lord's Prayer; the interruption of the prayers by the frequent responses of the people, which in some places seem to be little better than vain repetitions.

Neal's History of the Puritans.

MATTHEW vi. 32.

"Your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things."

A sect of the second century contended, that prayer was unnecessary; grounding their doctrine on this passage.

See Dictionn. des Hérésies, Art. Cyrenaiques.

MATTHEW vii. 7.

"Seek and ye shall find."

(SEEKERS AND RANTERS.)

The Seekers derive their name from their maintaining, that the true Church, Ministry, Scriptures, and Ordinances were lost, for which they were seeking.

They taught that the Scriptures are uncertain; that present miracles are necessary to faith; that our ministry is without authority, and our worship and ordinances unnecessary or vain.

The Ranters, who arose about the same period, (17th century) held opinions nearly similar.

See Calamy's Abridgment of Baxter's History.

MATTHEW viii. 28.

"Two possessed with devils."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"Two who had demons; i. e. Two madmen."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

MATTHEW viii. 32.

"They went into the herd of swine."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"i. e. The insanity passed into the herd of swine."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

MATTHEW ix. 21.

"If I may but touch his garment."

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

In the Table of Controversies affixed to the Roman Catholic Version, this text and Acts xix. 12, are given as authorities for the veneration of relics.

(See Mr. Butler's note Heb. xi. 21. No. 2.)

MATTHEW x. 2.

"Twelve Apostles."

(MANICHEANS.)

The general assembly of the Manicheans was headed by a president, who represented Jesus Christ; there were joined to him *twelve rulers*, or *masters*, who were designed to represent the *twelve Apostles*, and these were followed by *seventy* bishops, the images of the *seventy* disciples of our Lord. These bishops had presbyters and deacons under them, and all the members of these religious orders were chosen out of the class of the *elect*.

See this amply proved in the work entitled "Commentarii de rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum magnum."

MATTHEW x. 8.

"Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils."

(SHAKERS.)

The Shakers believe that they have power to heal the sick, to raise the dead, and to cast out devils.

This they say is performed by the preaching of the word of God, when it is attended with the divine power, the wonderful energy and operation of the Holy Spirit, which performs those things by healing the broken-hearted, raising up those who are dead in trespasses and sins to a life of holiness and righteousness, which causes the devils to be cast out.

This sect was instituted in the year 1774; Ann Lee, whom they styled the "Elect Lady," was the head of the party. She went to America in 1774.

In the account these people give of themselves, says Mr. Evans, they mention the *Quakers* in the time of Oliver Cromwell, and the *French prophets* of a later date, as being the first who had a *peculiar testimony* from the Lord to deliver the Christian world. But they complain, that the former degenerated, "losing that desire of love and power with which they first set out," and the latter being of short continuance, their "extraordinary communications" have long ago ceased.

"In their meetings," Mr. Adam remarks, "the Shakers have praying, preaching, singing, and dancing, the men in one apartment, the women in another. They vary their exercises of devotion. Their heavy dancing, as it is called, is performed by a perpetual springing from the house-floor, about four inches up and down, both in the men's and women's apartment, moving about with extraordinary transport, singing sometimes one at a time, and sometimes more. They sometimes clap their hands and leap so high as to strike the joists above their heads. This elevation affects the nerves, so that they have intervals of shuddering, as if they were in a violent fit of the ague. They even throw off their outside garments in these exercises, and spend

their strength very cheerfully in this way; and when their chief speaker calls for their attention, after joining in prayer with him, or listening to his harangue, they immediately renew their dancing with increased vigour. Sometimes there will be short intermissions; but in a minute or two one of the chiefs will spring up, crying, ‘As David danced; so will we before God.’ The others follow this signal; and thus alternately dancing, praying, and singing, they pass night after night, and often continue until morning.”

See Rathbone, Taylor, and West's accounts of the Shakers, and Janson's Stranger in America.

MATTHEW xii. 32.

“Neither in the world to come.”

No. 1.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

“From these words St. Augustine (*De Civ. l. xxi. c. 13.*) and St. Gregory (*Dialog. l. iv. c. 39.*) gather, that some sins may be remitted in the world to come; and consequently that there is a purgatory or a middle place.”

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

No. 2.

(PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD.)

Speaking of “prayers for the dead,” Mr. Butler remarks, that the Council of Trent has decreed (*Sess. 25. Decretum de Purgatione, p. 286.*) that “there is a purgatory, and that the souls detained in it are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.”

The nature and extent of these suffrages are thus explained by St. Augustine: "When the sacrifice of the altar, or alms, are offered for the dead, then, in regard to those whose lives were very good, such sacrifices may be deemed acts of thanksgiving. In regard to the imperfect, they may be deemed acts of propitiation; though they bring no aid to the very bad, they may give some comfort to the living."

Butler's Book of the Roman Catholic Church.

No. 3.

(PURGATORY AND INDULGENCES.)

(See also Notes on Matt. xvi. 19. Nos. 1, 2.)

The Roman Catholic Church teaches that God frequently remits the essential guilt of sin, and the eternal punishment incurred by it, but leaves a temporal punishment to be incurred by the sinner; that this temporal punishment may consist either of evil in this life, or of temporal suffering in the next; which temporal suffering in the next life we call Purgatory; that the temporal punishment may consist of both these inflictions, and that the church has received power from God to remit them either wholly or partially.

This remission is called an indulgence. When the temporal punishment is wholly remitted, the indulgence is said to be *plenary*; when the remission is partial, the indulgence is proportionably limited. Thus, an indulgence of a certain number of days, or of months, or years, is a remission, during that period of time, of the temporal punishment due to the sinner.

To every indulgence conditions are annexed; the first is sincere repentance. Now, in the under-

standing of the Catholic Church, sincere repentance always includes a sincere sorrow for having offended God; and, when a neighbour has been injured, full reparation for the injury, when the circumstances of the penitent allow it; or, when this is not the case, the fullest reparation in his power, with a firm resolution to complete it, if his circumstances should afterwards enable him so to do. This restitution equally extends to injuries in character, as to personal or peculiar injuries. It is never dispensed with. Will the making of it reduce the penitent to indigence? will it occasion the loss of his own character? still the priest insists upon its being made.

Such is the doctrine, such the practice of the Roman Catholic Church respecting indulgences.

Butler's Book of the Roman Catholic Church.

No. 4.

In the fifth century, the famous Pagan doctrine, concerning the *purification of departed souls*, by means of a certain kind of *fire*, was more amply explained and confirmed than it had formerly been.

See particularly concerning this matter, Augustin de 8 Questionibus ad dulcitium, &c.

Dr. Southey describes purgatory as “a place, according to the popular belief, so near the region of everlasting torments, though separated from it, that the same fire pervaded both, acting indeed to a different end and in different degrees; but even in its mildest effect, inflicting sufferings more intense than heart could think, or tongue express; and enduring for a length of time, which was left fearfully indefinite.”

Southey's Book of the Church.

No. 5. (PRIVATE MASSES.)

Solitary or *private* masses were those that were celebrated by the priest alone in behalf of souls detained in purgatory, as well as upon some other particular occasions. These masses were prohibited by the laws of the church, but they were a rich source of profit to the clergy. They were condemned by the canons of a synod assembled at Mentz, under Charlemagne, as criminal innovations, and as the fruits of avarice and sloth.

Maclaine's Note.

No. 6. (GREEK CHURCH.)

The Greek Church rejects the doctrine of purgatory, but admits masses and services for the dead.

See Gregory's History of the Christian Church, and Adam's Religious World displayed.

MATTHEW xii. 36.

"Every idle word."

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

"This shews there must be a place of temporal punishment hereafter, where these slighter faults shall be punished."

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

MATTHEW xiii. 39.

"The enemy that sowed them is the devil."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"The principle of evil personified—'Sons of the evil one,' are wicked men. Such, in the Old Tes-

tament, are called sons of Belial, or worthlessness, i. e. worthless men, 1 Sam. ii. 12. ; 1 Kings xxi. 10. See 2 Cor. vi. 15. ; Mark iv. 15."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

MATTHEW xv. 8.

" This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips ; but their heart is far from me."

(QUAKERS.)

The Quakers consider their mode of worship peculiarly calculated to prevent them from falling into the dangerous situation mentioned in this passage.

(See Note to John iv. 23, 24.)

MATTHEW xvi. 18.

" Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church."

No. 1.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

This passage is the foundation-stone of Catholicism. The Roman Catholics assert, that St. Peter, by Christ's ordinance, was raised to the supremacy; which his successors, under the title of Papa or Pope, should enjoy to the end of the world.

Hence the Roman Catholics infer the infallibility of their church, either in matters of faith or precept.

No. 2.

(THE POPE.)

Mr. Butler remarks, that " a chain of Roman Catholic writers on papal power might be supposed: on the first link we might place the Roman Catholic

writers, who have immoderately exalted the prerogative of the Pope; on the last we might place those, who have unduly depressed it; and the centre link might be considered to represent the canon of the tenth session of the Council of Florence, which defined, that ‘full power was delegated to the Bishop of Rome, in the person of St. Peter, to feed, regulate, and govern the universal church, as expressed in the general council and holy canons.’ *This is the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church on the authority of the Pope, and beyond it no Roman Catholic is required to believe.* Some opinions, represented by the intermediate links on each side of the central link, are allowed. Those, on one side, may be supposed to represent Orsi, and the author of the learned treatise, intitled ‘*Quis est Petrus?*’ who explain the doctrine, expressed in the council of Florence, in a manner very favourable to the papal prerogative; while the intermediate links, on the other side, represent Bossuet, La Marca, and other writers, who construe the canon in a more limited sense. The former have received the appellation of Transalpine divines; the latter, are called Cisalpine.

“ Universal Doctrine of the Roman Catholics respecting the Supremacy of the Pope.

“ It is an article of the *Roman Catholic faith*, that the Pope has by divine right, 1. A supremacy of rank. 2. A supremacy of jurisdiction in the spiritual concerns of the Roman Catholic Church; and, 3. The principal authority in defining articles of faith. In consequence of these prerogatives, the Pope holds a rank, splendidly pre-eminent, over the highest dignitaries of the church; has a right to con-

vene councils, and preside over them by himself, or his legates, and to confirm the election of Bishops. Every ecclesiastical cause may be brought to him, as the last resort, by appeal; he may promulgate definitions and formularies of faith to the universal church; and, when the general body, or a great majority of her prelates, have assented to them, either by formal consent, or tacit assent, all are bound to acquiesce in them.

“ ‘Rome,’ they say, in such case, ‘has spoken, and the cause is determined.’ To the Pope, in the opinion of all Roman Catholics, belongs also a general superintendence of the concerns of the church; a right, when the canons provide no line of action, to direct the proceedings; and, in extraordinary cases, to act in opposition to the canons. In those spiritual concerns, in which, by strict right, his authority is not definitive, he is entitled to the highest respect and deference. Thus far, there is no difference of opinion among Roman Catholics; but here, they divaricate into the Transalpine and Cisalpine opinions.

“Difference between Transalpine and Cisalpine Doctrines, on the Temporal and Spiritual Power of the Pope.

“ The great difference between the Transalpine and Cisalpine divines, on the power of the Pope, formerly was, that the *Transalpine* divines attributed to the Pope a divine right to the exercise, indirect at least, of temporal power, for effecting a spiritual good; and, in consequence of it, maintained, that the supreme power of every state was so far subject to the Pope, that, when he deemed that the bad conduct of the sovereign rendered it essential to the good of the church, that he should reign no longer;

the Pope was then authorized, by his divine commission, to deprive him of his sovereignty, and absolve his subjects from their obligation of allegiance; and that even, on ordinary occasions, he might enforce obedience to his spiritual legislation and jurisdiction, by civil penalties.

“ On the other hand, the *Cisalpine* divines affirmed, that the Pope had no right, either to interfere in temporal concerns, or to enforce obedience to his spiritual legislation or jurisdiction, by temporal power; and consequently, had no right to deprive a sovereign of his sovereignty, to absolve his subjects from their allegiance, or to enforce his spiritual authority over either, by civil penalties. This difference of opinion exists now no longer, the *Transalpine* divines having at length adopted, on this subject, the *Cisalpine* opinions.

“ But though, on this important point, both parties are at last agreed, they still differ on others.

“ In spiritual concerns, the *Transalpine* opinions ascribe to the Pope a superiority, and controlling power over the whole church, should she chance to oppose his decrees, and consequently, over a general council, her representative; and the same superiority and controlling power, even in the ordinary course of business, over the canons of the universal church. They describe the Pope as the fountain of all ecclesiastical order, jurisdiction and dignity. They assign to him the power of judging all persons in spiritual concerns; of calling all spiritual causes to his cognizance; of constituting, suspending and deposing Bishops; of conferring all ecclesiastical dignities and benefices, in or out of his dominions, by paramount authority; of exempting individuals and communities from the jurisdiction of their prelates; of

evoking to himself, or to judges appointed by him, any cause actually pending in an ecclesiastical court; and of receiving immediately appeals from all sentences of ecclesiastical courts, though they be inferior courts, from which there is a regular appeal to an intermediate superior court. They, farther, ascribe to the Pope the extraordinary prerogative of personal infallibility, when he undertakes to issue a solemn decision on any point of faith.

“The *Cisalpines* affirm, that in spirituals the Pope is subject, in doctrine and discipline, to the church, and to a general council representing her; that he is subject to the canons of the church, and cannot, except in an extreme case, dispense with them; that, even in such a case, his dispensation is subject to the judgment of the church; that the Bishops derive their jurisdiction from God himself immediately, and not derivatively through the Pope; that he has no right to confer bishoprics, or other spiritual benefices of any kind, the patronage of which, by common right, prescription, concordat, or any other general rule of the church, is vested in another. They admit, that an appeal lies to the Pope from the sentence of the Metropolitan; but assert, that no appeal lies to the Pope, and that he can evoke no cause to himself, during the intermediate process. They affirm, that a general council may without, and even against, the Pope’s consent, reform the church. They deny his personal infallibility, and hold that he may be deposed by the church, or a general council, for heresy or schism; and they admit, that in an extreme case, where there is a great division of opinion, an appeal lies from the Pope to a future general council.”

Butler’s Book of the Roman Catholic Church.

Opinions of foreign Universities on the Temporal Power of the Pope.

In pursuance of Mr. Pitt's suggestions, three questions were sent to the Universities of the Sorbonne, Louvaine, Douay, Alcala and Salamanca. They were expressed in the following terms, and received the following answers :

1. " Has the Pope, or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the church of Rome, any civil authority, power, jurisdiction or pre-eminence whatsoever, within the realm of England ?

2. " Can the Pope, or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the church of Rome, absolve or dispense with his Majesty's subjects, from their oath of allegiance, upon any pretext whatsoever ?

3. " Is there any principle in the tenets of the catholic faith, by which catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or other persons differing from them in religious opinions, in any transaction, either of a public or a private nature ?"

The Universities answered unanimously :

1. " That the Pope, or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the church of Rome, has not, nor have any civil authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence whatsoever, within the realm of England.

2. " That the Pope, or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the church of Rome, cannot absolve or dispense with his Majesty's subjects, from their oath of allegiance, upon any pretext whatsoever.

3. " That there is no principle in the tenets of the

catholic faith, by which catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or other persons differing from them in religious opinions, in any transactions, either of a public or a private nature."

The opinions of the Universities of the Sorbonne, Louvaine and Douay were first received, and were transmitted to Mr. Pitt, with the following letter :

" SIR,

" The committee of the English Catholics have the honor to lay before you, the opinions of the Universities of Sorbonne, Louvaine and Douay, which have been transmitted to us in consequence of your desire.

" You will, we hope, see, from these opinions, that the sentiments of the most famous foreign bodies perfectly coincide with those which we had the honor of stating to you last year, as our firm and sincere tenets.

" At the same time, we beg leave to call to your remembrance, that our opinions were fully stated to you previously to the obtaining those of the foreign universities ; and that they were consulted, not as the rule by which we form our ideas of the duties of good subjects, but as a collateral proof to you, that our sentiments are consonant to those of the most enlightened and famous bodies of Catholic divines on the continent upon these subjects.

We have the honor to be," &c.

As soon as the other opinions were received, the committee transmitted them also to Mr. Pitt.

A translation of all these answers is inserted in the appendix to the first volume of Mr. Butler's " Historical Memoirs of the English, Irish and Scottish Catholics."

No. 3.

The custom of kissing the feet of the Pope, upon his accession to the papacy, was quite established in the eighth century; though for some succeeding ages it was practised upon that occasion only.

This custom was derived, in common with various honors, from the sovereign Pontiff, to whose privileges the Bishop of Rome had succeeded. It had been introduced by the Emperor and Pontiff Caligula; probably in part to obtain one mark of adoration which had never been paid to his predecessors, and partly through the absurd vanity of exhibiting his magnificent slipper of gold, enriched with precious stones.

Gregory's History of the Christian Church.

No. 4.

(CARDINALS.)

At the commencement of the eighth century, the Cardinal Priests held no considerable rank, nor were they admitted into the councils till 764. In the eleventh century the Cardinals appear to be necessarily joined with the Clergy in the election of a Pope; and about one hundred years after this they obtained, that they should have the sole nomination; and by degrees have become the Pope's great council. In 1244, Innocent IV. ordered, that when the Cardinals rode out, they should wear a red hat, to shew that they were ready to shed their blood in the cause of the Church. In 1471, Paul II. ordained, that they should wear robes of scarlet. All other persons, and even kings and emperors, must kiss only the Pope's toe; but the Cardinals kiss his hands and

mouth. If a Cardinal accidentally meet a man going to execution, he has a power of saving his life; and it is said, that none of them can be condemned for a crime under seventy-two witnesses, if he be a Cardinal Bishop; sixty-two if he be a Cardinal Priest; and twenty-seven if he be a Cardinal Deacon.

See History of Popery, viii. p. 53.

No. 5.

(GREEK CHURCH.)

The word Papa was given indiscriminately, in the first ages of Christianity, to all Bishops, and in the East to all Ecclesiastics, till Gregory VII. ordered it to be reserved to the Bishop of Rome alone. But the separation between the Latin and Greek Churches having taken place before his Pontificate, the Greek Christians did not respect this order, and, therefore, still design their inferior clergy by the title of Papas.

See Bingham l. i. c. 2. and Adams' Religious World.

MATTHEW xvi. 19.

“Whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.”

No. 1.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

“Loose on earth.—The loosing the bands of temporal punishment due to sins, is called an Indulgence; the power of which is here granted.”

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

The obligation of confession is likewise gathered from this power given to the priesthood.

No. 2.

(INDULGENCES.—SUPEREROGATION.)

(See also Note on Matt. xii. 32. No. 3.)

Dr. Mosheim observes, that in the twelfth century, when the bishops wanted money for their private pleasures, or for the exigencies of the church, they granted to their flock the power of purchasing the remission of the penalties imposed upon transgressors, by a sum of money, which was to be applied to certain religious purposes, or, in other words, they published *Indulgences*, which became an inexhaustible source of opulence to the episcopal orders, and enabled them, as is well known, to form and execute the most difficult schemes for the enlargement of their authority, and to erect a number of sacred edifices, which augmented considerably the external pomp and splendor of the church.

Stephanus, Obasinensis in Balusii Miscellan. tom. iv. p. 130. Mabillon Annal. Benedict. tom. vi. p. 535, &c.

When the Roman Pontiffs cast an eye upon the immense treasures that the inferior rulers of the church were accumulating by the sale of Indulgences, they thought proper to limit the power of the bishops in remitting the penalties imposed upon transgressors, and assumed, almost entirely, this profitable traffic to themselves.

In consequence of this new measure, the Court of Rome became the general magazine of Indulgences; and the Pontiffs, when prompted to look out for new subsidies, published not only an universal, but also a complete, or what they called a *Plenary* remission of all the *temporal* pains and penál-

ties which the church had annexed to certain transgressions.

They went still farther, and not only remitted the penalties which the civil and ecclesiastical laws had enacted against transgressors, but pretended to abolish even the punishments which are reserved in a future state for the workers of iniquity; a step this, which the bishops had never once ventured to take.

Morinus, de Administratione Sacramenti Pœnitentiæ, lib. x. cap. 20, 21, 22. R. Simon, Biblioth. Critique, tom. iii. cap. 33. p. 371. Mabillon Præf. ad Acta Sanctor. Sæc. 5. Acta Sanctor. Bened. p. 54.

To justify these measures of the Pontiffs, a doctrine was invented, which was modified and embellished by St. Thomas in the following century, and which contained, among others, the following enormities, “ That there actually existed an immense treasure of *merit*, composed of the pious deeds and virtuous actions which the saints had performed *beyond what was necessary* for their own salvation (these works are known by the name of works of supererogation), and which were, therefore, applicable to the benefit of others: that the guardian and dispenser of this precious treasure was the Roman Pontiff; and that, of consequence, he was empowered to assign to such as he thought proper a portion of this inexhaustible source of merit, suitable to their respective guilt, and sufficient to deliver them from the punishment due to their crimes.”

For a satisfactory and ample account of the Doctrine of Indulgences, see a very learned and judicious Work, entitled “Lettres sur les Jubilés,” published in the year 1751, in 3 vols. 8vo. By the Rev. Mr. Chais, Minister of the French Church in the Hague, on occa-

sion of the Universal Jubilee, celebrated at Rome the preceding year, by the order of Benedict XIV.

Dr. Southey remarks on this subject, that "One drop of the Redeemer's blood being sufficient to redeem the whole human race, the rest which had been shed during the passion was given as a legacy, to be applied in mitigation of purgatory, as the Popes might think fit. So they declared, and so the people believed! If the Popes wished to promote a new practice of devotion, or encourage a particular shrine, they granted to those who should perform the one, or visit the other, an *indulgence*, that is, a dispensation for so many years of purgatory; sometimes for shorter terms, but often by centuries, or thousands of years; and in many cases the Indulgences were plenary."

Southey's Book of the Church.

No. 3.

(THE JUBILEE.)

Towards the conclusion of the thirteenth century, Boniface VIII. added to the public rites of the church the famous Jubilee, which is still celebrated at Rome at a stated period.

This Pontiff issued an epistolary mandate, addressed to all Christians, in which he enacted it as a solemn law of the church, that those who every hundredth or Jubilee year confessed their sins, and visited, with sentiments of contrition and repentance, the Churches of St. Peter and St. Paul, at Rome, should obtain the entire remission of their various offences. The successors of Boniface were not satisfied with adding a multitude of new rites

and inventions by way of ornaments to this institution, but rendered its return more frequent, and fixed its celebration to every five and twentieth year.

The various writers who have treated of the Institution of the Roman Jubilee, are enumerated by J. Albert. Fabricius, in his Bibliograph. Antiquar. p. 316.

No. 4.

(EXCOMMUNICATION.)

The Excommunication, from the time of Constantine the Great, was, in every part of the Christian world, attended with many disagreeable effects; yet its highest terrors were confined to Europe, where its aspect was truly formidable and hideous. It acquired also, in the eighth century, new accessions of terror; so that from that period, the *excommunication* practised in *Europe*, differed entirely from that which was in use in other parts of Christendom. Excommunicated persons were, indeed, considered in all places as objects of aversion both to God and men; but they were not, on this account, robbed of the privileges of citizens, nor of the rights of humanity; much less were those kings and princes, whom a bishop had thought proper to exclude from the communion of the church, supposed to forfeit, on that account, their crown or their territories. But from the eighth century, it was quite otherwise in Europe; excommunication received that infernal power which dissolved all connections; so that those whom the bishops or their chief excluded from church communion, were degraded to a level with the beasts. Under this horrid sentence, the king, the ruler, the husband,

The father, nay, even the man, forfeited all their rights, all their advantages, the claims of nature, and the privileges of society. What then was the origin of this unnatural power which excommunication acquired? It was briefly as follows: Upon the conversion of the barbarous nations to Christianity, these new and ignorant proselytes confounded the excommunication in use among Christians, with that which had been practised in the times of Paganism by the priests of the gods, and considered them as of the same nature and effect. The Roman Pontiffs, on the other hand, were too artful not to countenance and encourage this error; and, therefore, employed all sorts of means to gain credit to an opinion so proper to gratify their ambition, and to aggrandize, in general, the episcopal order. That this is the true origin of the extensive and horrid influence of the European and Papal excommunication, will appear evident to such as cast an eye upon the following passage of Cæsar: *De Bello Gallico*, lib. vi. cap. 13. “*Si qui aut privatus aut publicus Druidum decreto non stetit, sacrificiis interdicunt. Hæc pœna est apud eos gravissima. Quibus ita est interdictum, ii numero impiorum et sceleratorum habentur, iis omnes decedunt, aditum eorum sermonemque defugiant, ne quid ex contagione incommodi accipiant: neque iis petentibus jus redditur, neque honos ullus communicatur.*”

Mosheim.

Between the seventh and tenth centuries, great solemnities were added to the sentence of excommunication. The most important was the extinction of lamps or candles, by throwing them to the ground, with a solemn imprecation, that the per-

son against whom the excommunication was pronounced, might be extinguished or destroyed by the vengeance of God. The people were summoned to attend this ceremony by the sound of a bell; and the curses accompanying the ceremony were pronounced out of a book by the minister, standing in a balcony. Hence originated the phrase of cursing, by bell, book, and candle-light.

Priestley's Corruptions of Christianity, vol. ii. p. 179.

No. 5.

(THE GREEK CHURCH.)

The fear of excommunication has a most powerful effect upon the Modern Greeks. Even the most hardened tremble at a sentence which separates them from the unity of the church, and obliges the faithful to deny even the most common duties of charity to their fellow-creatures.

According to an account given to us, the common people believe, that a person once excommunicated, is incapable of returning to his original principles, and that the sentence of excommunication can never be withdrawn.

They believe, it is said, that a demon enters the body of persons who have died under excommunication, and that he preserves the body from corruption by giving it a new life. These resuscitated persons are farther supposed to eat and walk during the night. If their superstition be not exaggerated, the state of an excommunicated person after death, corresponds with the vulgar and fictitious idea of a Vampire.

See Ricaut's State of the Greek Church.

MATTHEW xvii. 1, 2.

“ Into an high mountain—and his face did shine as the sun.”

(QUIETISTS OR NAVELEERS.)

Barlaam, a noted monk, of the order of Basil, and afterwards Bishop of Gieraci in Calabria, made a tour through Greece towards the middle of the fourteenth century, for the sake of inspecting the Monks; the Greeks having had no little trouble given them by the Hesychasts or Quietists.

On Mount Athos, in Thessaly, he found these Quietists, whom he called Messalians, Euchites, and Navelers. Imagining that a long course of intense contemplation would produce perfect tranquillity of mind, they used every day to sit a considerable time in a solitary corner, with their eyes intently fixed on their navel; and boasted, that while they did so, they found the divine light beaming forth from the soul, and diffusing through the heart inexpressible sensations of pleasure and delight. This light*, they asserted, was the glory of God that surrounded our Saviour upon the Mount of Transfiguration.

“ We have no reason,” says Dr. Mosheim, “ to be surprised at, and much less to disbelieve, this account; for it is a fundamental rule with all those people in the Eastern world, whether Christians, Mahometans, or Pagans, (who maintain the necessity of abstracting the mind from the body, in order to hold communion with God, which is exactly the

* In consequence of Barlaam having attacked the opinion of the Hesychasts, respecting the nature of this light, a council was assembled to decide the question, and Barlaam was condemned.

same thing with the contemplative and mystic (among the Latins), that the eyes must be steadily fixed every day for some hours upon some particular object; and that he who complies with this precept will be thrown into an ecstasy, in which, being united to God, he will see wonderful things, and be entertained with ineffable delights. See what is said concerning the Siamese Monks, and Mystics by Engelb Kœmpfer, in his History of Japan, tom. i. p. 30. and also concerning those of India, in the Voyages of Bermier, tom. i. p. 127."

See Diction. des Hérésies, Art. Hesicastes.

MATTHEW xvii. 3.

"There appeared unto them Moses and Elias."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"Hence it appears probable, that the account of the death of Moses in the last chapter of Deuteronomy, is erroneous; and that he like Elijah, was translated. See Dr. Priestley's Harmony. They were probably the persons who appeared to the women at our Lord's sepulchre. Luke xxiv. and to the Apostles upon the Mount of Olives, Acts i. 12."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

MATTHEW xviii. 10.

"Their Angels."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"An emblematical representation of the care of Divine Providence over little children."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

MATTHEW xix. 11.

"All men take not this word."—Roman Catholic Version.

No. 1.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

"Protestants have corrupted the text by rendering it, '*All men cannot receive this saying,*' to excuse the sacrilegious marriages of the first Reformers."

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

No. 2.

One of the injunctions issued A. D. 1559, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, was as follows :

Art. 29. "No Priest or Deacon shall marry without allowance of the Bishop of his diocese, and two justices of the peace ; nor without consent of the parents of the woman, if she have any, or others that are nearest of kin, upon penalty of being incapable of holding any ecclesiastical promotion, or ministering in the word and sacraments. Nor shall Bishops marry without allowance of their Metropolitan, and such commissioners as the Queen shall appoint."

No. 3.

(GREEK CHURCH.)

All orders of secular Clergy in the Greek Church, inferior to Bishops, are permitted to marry ; and the married Papas are distinguished by a fillet of white muslin around their bonnet of black felt*, and are never promoted to a higher dignity than that of Protopapas of the Church in which they serve. The regular Clergy, we are told, are generally men

* Mr. Dallaway observes, that "they likewise wear long beards universally."

of a certain education ; whereas the seculars are of the meanest sort, and illiterate in the extreme *.

—

MATTHEW xix. 21.

“ If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast and give to the poor.”

No. 1.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

Citing Matt. xix. 21. Matt. xvi. 24. 1 Cor. vii. 1. and 1 Cor. vii. 38. Mr. Butler asks, “ Is it not with justice that the Roman Catholic considers these intimations, not as precepts, the observance of which is necessary to salvation, but as counsels to those, who, to use the words of Christ himself, desire to be perfect ? Do they not imply, that a voluntary renunciation of riches, a voluntary renunciation of our will, and a voluntary renunciation of sensual, but lawful pleasure, are acceptable to God ?

“ Do we not imitate, by the first, the voluntary poverty of our holy Redeemer ? By the second, his voluntary obedience to the will of his Eternal Father, and to the will of his virgin mother ? By the third, his immaculate purity ?

“ To this humble imitation of Christ, the Mendicant, and the other religious orders of the Catholic Church aspire ; and their different rules prescribe different modes, suited to the various characters and tempers of mankind, of carrying these counsels into execution. In what age of the church were not such observances practised ? In what have they not been praised by the wise and the good ?”

Butler's Book of the Roman Catholic Church.

* Dallaway and Sir P. Ricaut.

No. 2.

(MONKS AND NUNS.)

The actual establishment of monachism is to be dated from the fourth century. There were indeed several solitaries, who, in the preceding ages, had sequestered themselves from the employments of social life; but the Egyptian Anthony appears to have been the first who induced any considerable number to associate with him in the monastic state.

From Egypt, the monastic institution is said by most writers, following the opinions of Baronius, to have been brought into Italy by Athanasius, (A. D. 340.) who was also the first who built a monastery at Rome.

Egypt was the great theatre for monastic action, and at the close of the fourth century it was computed that 47,000 monks and nuns were to be found in the country.

Ambrose exhorted virgins to enter into monasteries, even without the consent of their parents.

It had been a practice for virgins to dedicate themselves to God at a period anterior to the foundation of monasteries; and they lived with, and were maintained by, their parents, except they were in very indigent circumstances, when they were supported by the church, in whose canon (*matricula*) or catalogue they were commonly enrolled.

The monks were divided into different orders according to the different modes of life which they were disposed to adopt. The Cœnobites* were associated under a governor, and dwelt in fixed habitations. The Eremites† solitarily resided in deserts,

* From *κοινος* common, and *βιος* life: i. e. living in a community.

† From *ερημος* a desert.

caves, or holes in the earth. The Anachorites* wildly wandered in the most sequestered retreats, supporting life by the spontaneous productions of the earth, without any settled places of abode. The Sarabaites† were the venders of pretended relics, and the performers of fictitious miracles. All these orders originally included, equally, both the laity and clergy; but the increasing respect paid to these pretensions of extraordinary sanctity, occasioned some of the best benefices in the church to be offered to the monks, and in time the greater number of them were engaged in the immediate service of the church.

At the commencement of the fifth century monachism is said to have been introduced into Britain by Pelagius.

Speaking of the state of monachism in the eighth century, Mr. Gregory informs us, that those who, after partaking of the regenerating waters of baptism, had relapsed into sin, were persuaded that they might regain the purity they had forfeited by their iniquities, by the assumption of the monastic habit, which contained all the virtues of a second baptism. In consequence of this belief, and the increasing veneration for monastic institutions, several monarchs assumed the habits of monks; and, in the short period of little more than two centuries, thirty English kings or queens resigned the splendour of royalty for the retirement of a cloister.

In the ninth century monastic life was in the highest esteem, and nothing could equal the veneration

* From *αναχωρεω* to separate from society.

† Derived by some from the Hebrew word *sarab*, to rebel—from their irregular and disorderly lives.

that was paid to such as devoted themselves to the sacred gloom and indolence of a convent. The Greeks and Orientals had been long accustomed to regard the monkish orders and discipline with the greatest admiration ; but it was only since the beginning of the eighth century that this holy passion was indulged among the Latins to such an extravagant length. In the ninth, however, it was extended beyond all bounds ; kings, dukes, and counts, forgot their true dignity, even the fulfilling with zeal the duties of their high stations ; and affected that contempt of the world and its grandeur, which they mistook for magnanimity and true devotion.

In the fourteenth century the monks grew worse and worse ; nor could such popes, as were so inclined, reform them. The Mendicants, chiefly those of St. Francis and Dominic, had the chief influence in the court of Rome. The vulgar believed, that these sturdy beggars, by their sanctity and interest with God, had the disposal of heaven and hell at their will. Hence, multitudes of both sexes, in health and in weakness, but especially in their dying moments, begged to be admitted among them. Many made it an article of their latter will that their corpses should be wrapped in old clothes, and interred among them, as an effectual means of protection from the vengeance of God, and of securing an happy appearance at the tribunal of Christ, along with these favourites of heaven. As the wealth and fame of these beggarly saints increased, they abandoned themselves to wickedness. Provoked with their conduct, the university of Oxford made a noble stand against the encroachments of the Dominicans ; whilst Richard, Archbishop of Armagh, in Ireland ;

and others, with great vehemence and severity attacked the Mendicant orders in general.

See Bingham's Ecc. Antiq. Mosheim and Gregory.

No. 3. (MENDICANT FRIARS, OR BEGGING BRETHREN.)

Pope Innocent III. considering some orders to be necessary, which should make poverty a part of their rule, shewed them particular regard. In consequence of which, such multitudes of Mendicant Friars, or Begging Brethren, started up, that Gregory X., in the Council of Lyons, was obliged to suppress several orders, which had sprung up after the Lateran Council, and to reduce the Mendicants to the four orders of Dominicans, Franciscans, Carmelites, now transported to Egypt about 1224, and the Hermits of Augustine, whom Alexander IV. had united under one rule of discipline in 1256. These sanctimonious beggars being allowed to travel wherever they thought proper, and to converse with people of all ranks, and instruct the youth, quickly arrived at the very summit of fame. Several cities were cantoned into four parts, assigned to the four Mendicant orders. To the no small offence of the established clergy, the people crowded to hear the Mendicants, unwillingly received the Sacraments from any other, and were even anxious to be buried among them in their churches when dead. Nay, these holy beggars were quickly employed in political affairs of the greatest importance; in composing differences between princes; in forming of treaties; in presiding in privy councils; in governing of courts; levying of taxes; and other occupations absolutely inconsistent with their monastic profession.

The two first orders made the principal figure, and for three hundred years governed with an almost universal sway, maintaining the majesty and prerogative of the Romish See with incredible ardour and success; and were, as the Jesuits have been since, the soul of the hierarchy, the engines of the state, and the authors or directors of every thing important in the religious or political world.

Brown's History of the Christian Church.

In the year 1529, Simon Frith, of Gray's Inn, published a book, entitled "The Supplication of the Beggars." It was levelled against the begging friars, and complains, that the common poor were ready to starve, because the alms of the people were intercepted by great companies of lusty idle friars, who were able to work, and were a burden to the commonwealth.

Fisher and Sir Thomas More answered the book, endeavouring to move the people's passions, by representing the supplications of the souls in purgatory, which were relieved by the masses of these friars.

Neal's History of the Puritans.

MATTHEW xx. 28.

"A ransom for many."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"The word translated *ransom*, signifies the price paid for the liberty of a slave; and, figuratively, any means of deliverance from bondage. So Deut. vii. 8.

God is said to have redeemed or ransomed 'the Israelites out of the house of bondage, from the hand of Pharaoh,' not by paying a price for them, but by the splendid and awful miracles which he wrought for their deliverance. See also Deut. ix. 26; xiii. 5. Neh. i. 10. In like manner, *the many*, that is, all mankind (Matt. xxvi. 28. Rom. v. 15. 18.) being in bondage to the Mosaic ritual, or to heathen superstition, are ransomed by the death of Christ, which is the means of their deliverance: not as the suffering of a substitute, but as the seal and ratification of a new and better covenant. See Newcome, Pearce, and Priestly, on the text; also Simpson's Ess. xiv. p. 260."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

MATTHEW xxi. 22.

"All things whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing ye shall receive."

(WESLEY.)

Mr. Wesley supposed that he, and such of his disciples who had faith like himself, could heal diseases, and cast out devils. Accordingly, he relates the cure of a mad woman, as a proof that "whatsoever ye shall ask, believing ye shall receive."

Dr. Southey details this and similar incidents at full length.

See Southey's Life of Wesley.

MATTHEW xxii. 37.

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul."

(MOLINOS—QUIETISTS—MYSTICS.)

Michael Molinos, one of the Quietists, or Mystics, published his *Spiritual Guide* about 1670 *.

He contended that the whole of religion consists in a calm tranquillity of the mind, centered upon God himself alone, and in a pure and disinterested love of him, independent of all prospect of reward.

The soul, he said, in the pursuit of supreme good, must retire from the reports and gratifications of sense, and, in general, from all corporeal objects, and imposing silence upon all the motions of the understanding and the will, must be absorbed in the Deity. Hence the denomination of *Quietists* was given to the followers of Molinos; though that of *Mystics*, which was their vulgar title, was more applicable, and expressed with more propriety their fanatical system.

In the fifth century the Mystics had drawn every where to their party, particularly in the Eastern provinces, a vast number of the ignorant and inconsiderate multitude, by the striking appearance of their austere and singular piety. It is impossible to describe the rigour and severity of the laws which these fanatics imposed upon themselves, in order, as they alleged, to appease the Deity, and to

* See the *Recueil de diverses pièces concernant le Quietisme et les Quietistes, ou Molinos ses sentimens et ses disciples.* 8vo. Amst. 1688. In which the reader will find a French translation of the *Spiritual Guide*.

deliver the *celestial spirit* from the bondage of the *mortal body**.

Madame Guyon and the renowned Fénelon have been distinguished among the modern Quietists. The former underwent a long imprisonment for her success in making converts to the way of contemplation and prayer, known by the name of Quietism. She spent her latter years in mystical rêveries; covering her tables, ceilings, and every thing that would receive them, with the sallies of a visionary imagination.



MATTHEW xxiii. 8. 10.

“Be not ye called Rabbi—neither be ye called Masters.”

(QUAKERS.)

The Quakers object to the application of the titles of Master and Mistress, to those who do not stand in this relation to them: the same remark applies to any title.

“We apprehend,” says Mr. Gurney, “that our heavenly guide, whose spirit is expressly denominated, the ‘Spirit of Truth,’ and whose will is directly opposed to all unrighteous vanities, of whatsoever magnitude and description they may be, has taught us in our communications one with another, and with our fellow-men, to abstain from the use of these various complimentary fictions. The substitution of a plain mode of expression, in the place of one so nearly universal, has, indeed, the effect of rendering us singular; and the singularity which is

* See the *Pratum Spirituale* of Moschus; the *Lausiac Hist.* of Palladius; as also Sulpitius Severus *Dial.* I.

thus occasioned, and which sometimes entails upon us ridicule and contempt, is often, in no slight degree, mortifying to the natural inclinations, especially to those of the young and tender minds. Nevertheless, we are persuaded, that this is one of the particulars of conduct in which, however trifling the subject may appear to some persons, a duty is laid upon us to deny ourselves, patiently to endure the cross, and faithfully to bear our testimony against the customs prevalent in the world at large. It is plain, according to our view of the subject, that the common mode of speech from which we have thus been led to abstain, is at variance with certain acknowledged and important principles in the divine law. Such a phraseology may very fairly be deemed objectionable; first, because it is intended to flatter the pride of man; and secondly, because it is inconsistent with truth."

See Gurney's Observations on the Religious Peculiarities of the Society of Friends.



MATTHEW xxiv. 24.

"False Christs, and false apostles."

No. 1.

(APOLLONIUS TYANÆUS.)

It is a thing highly probable, if not unquestionable, that Apollonius Tyanæus, shortly after the publication of the Gospel to the world, was a person made choice of by the policy, and assisted by the powers of the kingdom of darkness, for the doing of some things extraordinary; merely out of design, to derogate from the miracles of our Saviour Christ, and to enable Paganism the better to bear up against the assaults of Christianity. For amongst

the many writers of this philosopher's life, some, and particularly Philostratus, seem to have had no other aim in this their whole undertaking, than only to dress up Apollonius in such a garb and manner, as might make him best seem to be a fit corival with our Saviour Christ, both in respect of sanctity and miracles. Eunapius, therefore, telling us, that he mistitled his book, and that instead of *Ἀπολλωνίου βίος*, "the life of Apollonius," he should have called it, *Θεοῦ εἰς ἀνθρώπους ἐπιδημίαν*, "the coming down and converse of God with men;" for as much as this Apollonius, saith he, was not a bare philosopher, or man, *ἀλλά τι Θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπου μέσον*, but a certain middle thing betwixt the gods and men. And that this was the use commonly made by the Pagans of this history of Apollonius, viz. to set him up in way of opposition and rivalry to our Saviour Christ, appears sundry ways.

Cudworth, book i. c. 4. p. 266.

No. 2.

(FALSE CHRISTS.)

In almost every age of Christianity, there have been impostors or fanatics, who have assumed the title of Messiah.

In the twelfth century alone, Mr. Gregory mentions the following instances. "In 1137, the Persians were disturbed by a Jew, who called himself the Messiah, and collected together a formidable army of his countrymen. The Persian monarch submitted to a treaty with this religious usurper; he paid him a sum of money on the condition of disbanding his soldiers, but afterwards seized and beheaded him; and compelled the Jews to refund

the money he had given to their Messiah, which reduced them to beggary, and even to the necessity of selling their children. In the following year, a false Christ appeared in France; he was put to death, and many Jews suffered at the same time under the accusation, real or imaginary, of sacrificing a male Christian child once a year. About the year 1157, an impostor, under the title of Messiah, incited the Jews to revolt at Corduba, and this unfortunate event occasioned the destruction of almost all the Jews in Spain. In 1167, another false prophet appeared in Arabia, who pretended to be the forerunner of the Messiah. When search was made for him, he was soon deserted by his followers, and being questioned by the Arabian king, he replied, that he was indeed a prophet sent from God. The king requiring a sign in confirmation of his mission, the unfortunate fanatic desired him to cut off his head, and asserted, that he should, presently, see him restored to life. His request was complied with; the event, however, by no means corresponded with the professions of the prophet, and the Arabian Jews were condemned to pay a heavy fine. In 1174, a magician and false Christ occasioned great trouble to the Jews in Persia; and in two years after, another arose in Moldavia, called David Almusser. He pretended that he could make himself invincible; but he was taken, and a heavy fine laid upon the Jews."

Gregory's History of the Christian Church.

MATTHEW xxiv. 31.

“*His Angels.*”

(UNITARIANISM.)

“Or, messengers, Apostles, and first preachers of the Gospel. Mark xiii. 27. Simpson.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.



MATTHEW xxiv. 36.

“*Knoweth no man, but my Father only.*”

No. 1. (ROMAN CATHOLICS AND ARIANS.)

This passage was the subject of a long dispute between the Roman Catholics and Arians, the latter concluded from it, that Jesus Christ is not God.



No. 2. (AGNOETÆ, OR NESCIENTS.)

In the sixth century, some of the Corrupticolæ, (for so they were called who looked upon the body of Christ to be corruptible) particularly Themistius, a deacon of Alexandria, and Theodosius, a bishop of that city, maintained, that Christ's *divine* nature knew all things, but some things were concealed from his *human*; on this account they were called Agnoetæ or Nescients.

Jo. Bapt. Cotelarius, ad Monumenta Ecclesiæ Græcæ, tom. iii. p. 641.
Mich. le Quien, ad Damascenum de Hæresibus, tom. i. p. 17.
Forbes Instruc. Historico Theolog. l. 3. c. 19. p. 119. Photius
Biblioth. Cod. 230. p. 882.

MATTHEW xxv. 41.

“Go ye cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the Devil and his angels.”

No: 1.

(PSELLUS.)

Psellus lays no small stress upon this passage, “I am also convinced of this, that demons have bodies, from the words of our Saviour affirming, that ‘they shall be punished with fire;’ which, how could it be, were they altogether incorporeal? it being impossible for that which is both itself incorporeal, and vitally ununited to any body, to suffer from a body. Wherefore of necessity it must be granted by us Christians, that devils shall receive punishment of sense and pain hereafter, in bodies capable of suffering.” (See Note on 1 Cor. xiii. 1.)

Cudworth, p. 817.

No. 2.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“The devil means here the wicked, as xiii. 39. Devil is vice personified. His angels are instruments of wickedness. The whole discourse from ver. 31, is about human beings; devil and his angels are used allegorically to denote human adversaries of Christianity, Rev. xii. 7. 12.; xx. 2. 7, 8. 10. See Simpson’s Ess. ii. p. 150.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

MATTHEW xxv. 46.

“Everlasting punishment.”

(UNITARIANISM.)

“The word here rendered *punishment*, properly signifies correction inflicted for the benefit of the

offender. And the word translated *everlasting*, is often used to express a long but indefinite duration, Rom. xvi. 2.; 2 Tim. i. 9.; Philemon ver. 15. This text, therefore, so far from giving countenance to the harsh doctrine of eternal misery, is rather favourable to the more pleasing, and more probable hypothesis, of the ultimate restitution of the wicked to virtue and to happiness. See Simpson's *Essay on Future Punishment*."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

MATTHEW xxvi. 26.

"This is my body."

No. 1.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

The Roman Catholics interpret this passage, as also Mark xiv. 22. 24.; Luke xxii. 19.; John vi. 51, 52. literally, and found upon them the doctrine of transubstantiation.

"*This is my body*. He does not say, this is the figure of my body, but this is my body (2 Council of Nice, Act. 6.) neither does he say in this, or with this is my body; but absolutely this is my body, which plainly implies transubstantiation."

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

No. 2.

Transubstantiation was declared by Innocent III. at the fourth Lateran Council to be a tenet necessary to salvation.

Innocent also introduced and established the use of the term transubstantiation, which was hitherto

unknown. The word was invented by Petrus Ble-
sensis, A. D. 1160.

See Cave.

The use of the thin wafer had its rise about the end of the twelfth century; and its origin appears to have been a desire of preventing, as much as possible, the chance of any part of the sacred elements being wasted, or applied to any improper use, as they were held to be the real body and blood of Christ.

Gregory's History of the Christian Church.

In 1201, the Pope's legate, at Cologne, ordered that, in the mass, at the elevation of the host (hostia, or sacrifice, so the sacred elements were called) all the people should prostrate themselves.

See Jortin.

No. 3.

(GREEK CHURCH.)

Archbishop Plato, giving the sentiments of the Greek Church in general, on the subject of transubstantiation, says, "Ecclesia Catholica orientalis, atque Græcorussica, admittit quidem vocem transubstantiatio Græce μετουσίωσις; *non physicam illam transubstantiationem et carnalem, sed sacramentalem et mysticam*; eodemque sensu hanc vocem, transubstantiatio, accipit, quam quo, antiquissimi Ecclēs: Græcæ patres, has voces μεταλλαγή, μεταθεσις, μεταστροφείωσις accipiebant."

See M. Duten's Œuvres Mêlées, p. 171.

In the Greek Church, it is deemed essential to the validity of the holy Sacrament, that a little warm water be mixed with the wine. It may also be ob-

served, that leavened bread is used in this sacrament; that children may receive the communion immediately after baptism; that the clergy receive the elements separately; and that the lay communicants, of whatever age, receive both the elements together, the bread being sopped in the cup, and that they receive them standing, provided their age, &c. will admit of that posture.

Adam's Religious World.

No. 4.

(RUSSIAN CHURCH.)

In the Russian, as well as in the other branches of the Greek Church, the laity always receive both elements together.

Those who wish to communicate, approach one after another, bowing with all humility and reverence, and holding their hands on their breasts. The priest mentions every communicant's name: N. N. the servant of God, doth partake of the pure and holy body and blood of our Lord, our God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, for the remission of his sins, and for eternal life. Amen. The communicant then wipes his lips with the holy covering, and kissing the holy cup, retires bowing.

See King, on the Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church.

No. 5.

(PAULICIANS.)

The Paulicians understood the bread and wine said to be administered by Christ to his disciples at the last supper, to be a figurative expression, implying the divine discourses and exhortations of the Saviour, which are a spiritual food and nourishment to the soul.

Petrus Seculus.

No. 6.

(TATIANISTS.)

The disciples of Tatian, who were denominated Encratites or Temperate, Hydroparastates or Water-drinkers and Apotactites or Renouncers, allowed only water in the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

See Epiph. Aug. de Hær. c. 25. Cyprian, Ep. lxiii. l. 8. edit. Erasmi.

No. 7.

(LUTHER.)

Luther and his followers, though they had rejected the doctrine of the Church of Rome with respect to transubstantiation, or change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, were nevertheless of opinion, that the partakers of the Lord's supper received, together with the bread and wine, the real body and blood of Christ.

They made use of the term Impanation (which signifies the presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist, *in* or *with* the *bread* that is there exhibited, and amounts to what is called consubstantiation.) It was a modification of the doctrine of transubstantiation, first invented by some of the disciples of Berenger, who had not a mind to break all measures with the Church of Rome, and was afterwards adopted by Luther and his followers.

As in a red hot fire, said Luther, two distinct substances, viz. iron and fire are united, so is the body of Christ joined with the bread in the Eucharist.

See his treatise de Captivitate Babylonica, and his book against Henry VIII.

No. 8.

(ZUINGLE.)

Zuingle translated this passage, “ This represents my body.” His sentiments on the Eucharist were the same as those of the Church of England at the present day. The difference of opinion between Luther and Zuingle on this subject was the main cause of their long controversy.

Zuingle de verâ Relig. p. 202.

A Roman Catholic writer, observes of Zuingle, “ Il était fort occupé de la difficulté de concilier le sentiment de Carlosbad sur l'Eucharistie, avec les paroles de Jésus Christ, qui dit expressément : *ceci est mon corps*. Il eut un songe, dans lequel il croyait disputer avec le secrétaire de Zurich, qui le pressait vivement sur les paroles de l'institution : il vit paraître tout à coup un fantôme blanc ou noir, qui lui dit ces mots : ‘ lâche, que ne réponds tu ce qui est écrit dans l'Exode, l'agneau est la pâque, pour dire qu'il en est le signe.’ ”

See Dictionn. des Hérésies.

No. 9.

(SCHWENKFELDT.)

Schwenkfeldt, a Silesian knight, who lived in the middle of the sixteenth century, inverted the phrase “ this is my body,” and insisted upon its being translated and understood “ my body is this,” i. e. such as this bread which is broken and consumed, a true and real food which nourishes, satisfies, and delights the soul—“ my blood is this,” i. e. its effects are such as those of the wine which strengthens and refreshes the heart.

See an account of Schwenkfeldt's Confession of Faith in J. C. Kocheri Bibliotheca Theologiæ Symbolicæ, p. 457.

No. 10.

(BROWNISTS.)

According to the rules of the Brownists the powers of their church officers were confined within the narrow limits of their own society. The pastor of one church might not administer the sacrament of Baptism or the Lord's Supper to any but those of his own communion, and their immediate children.

See Neal.

No. 11.

The sects of the present day who do not observe the sacrament of the Lord's Supper are the Quakers, and, as Mr. Gurney relates, the Inspirés in Germany, and the Malakans in South Russia.

MATTHEW xxvi. 27.

" Drink ye all of this."

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

" This was spoken to the twelve Apostles ; who were the *all* then present, and *they all drank of it*, says St. Mark, xiv. 23. But it no ways follows from these words spoken to the Apostles, that all the faithful are here commanded to drink of the chalice, any more than that all the faithful are here commanded to consecrate, offer, and administer this sacrament ; because Christ, upon this same occasion, and, I may say, with the same breath, bid the Apostles do so ; in those words, St. Luke xxii. 19. ' Do this for a commemoration of me.' "

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

The Roman Catholic laity are not permitted to partake of the chalice. (See Note on John vi. 54.)

MATTHEW xxvi. 28.

“ Remission of sins.”

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ For the remission of sins, that is, for the confirmation of a covenant by which Gentiles, as well as Jews, will be made a holy people. The Gentiles being in an uncovenanted state, were regarded by the Jews as unholy, and are called sinners. See Gal. ii. 15. When, by faith in Christ, they entered into the Christian covenant, they became holy, and their sins are said to be forgiven. Thus the blood of Christ is said to have been shed for the remission of sins.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

MATTHEW xxvi. 41.

“ Watch and pray.”

No. 1.

(WATCHERS.)

In the beginning of the fifth century a new order of monks was instituted by a person of the name of Alexander, who obtained the name of Watchers from their method of performing divine service without any intermission. They divided themselves into three classes, which relieved each other at stated hours; and by that means continued without any interval a perpetual course of divine service. Many monasteries were erected for this order in Constantinople; and Studius, a man of consular dignity, forsaking the world, entered into their society, and

built for them an elegant monastery, which was named Studium, and the monks who resided in it, Studitæ, which is perhaps the first instance of that body deriving their appellation from their founder. As many of these monks embraced the tenets of Nestorius, the order in a short time sank rapidly in its credit.

Gregory's History of the Christian Church.

No. 2.

(QUAKERS.)

From these words the Quakers understand, that before entering into public or private prayer, they are to be engaged in true watchfulness, i. e. are to *wait* for the influence of the Holy Spirit upon the soul, to enable them to offer up their prayers suitably to their Creator.

Mr. Gurney, in his "Observations on the religious Peculiarities of the Society of Friends," observes, that "silence may be considered not only as affording a most useful opportunity for the production of this complete prostration before God in divine worship, but as being eminently suited to that condition of mind when it is already produced; for experience may serve to convince us, that it is the natural and frequent accompaniment of humiliation and subjection. As such it is repeatedly described by the ancient Hebrew prophets: 'I was dumb with silence, I held my peace even from God,' said David, when he had been suffering under the chastisement of the Lord, 'I was dumb, I opened not my mouth, because thou didst it.' Ps. xxxix. 2. 9. 'Why do we sit still,' cried the mournful Jeremiah, 'assemble yourselves, and let us enter into the de-

fenced cities, and *let us be silent there*, for the Lord our God hath *put us to silence*, and given us water of gall to drink, because we have sinned against the Lord.' ch. viii. 14. So also the prophets Habakkuk and Zechariah, when engaged in proclaiming the presence of Jehovah among men, did not fail to enjoin the silence of his creatures: 'But the Lord is in his holy temple, let all the earth *keep silence* before him.' Hab. ii. 20. 'Be silent, O all flesh, before the Lord, for he is raised up out of his holy habitation.' Zech. ii. 13. comp. Ps. xxxi. 18.; Isa. xv. 1.; 1 Pet. ii. 15.

"A second particular of indispensable importance to a true and spiritual worship is *waiting upon God*. The worshippers of the Almighty Jehovah must not only be humbled and cast down under an awful apprehension of his divine power and majesty; they must not only feel their own vileness and wants, but they must also look upwards unto God, as unto the Father of mercies, the fountain of wisdom and life, the author of every good and perfect gift. Their expectation must be placed on him alone, and they must learn *patiently to wait upon him*, until he shall be pleased to reveal his mercy, and to bestow upon his unworthy children 'grace to help in time of need.' On the subject of this important characteristic of true worship, none of the sacred writers appear to have received a more powerful impression than the devout and afflicted David. 'Unto thee lift I up mine eyes, O thou that dwellest in the heavens. Behold as the eyes of the servants (look) unto the hand of their masters, and as the eyes of a maiden unto the hand of her mistress, so our eyes (wait) upon the Lord our God, until that he have mercy upon us.' Ps. cxxiii. 1, 2. 'My soul wait

~~Thou~~ only upon God, for my expectation is from ~~him~~. Ps. lxii. 5. "Wait on the Lord: be of good courage and he shall strengthen thine heart; wait; I say, on the Lord." Ps. xxvii. 14. comp. xxxvii. 7. 9. cxxx. 5.; Isa. xxx. 18, &c."

MATTHEW xxvi. 52.

"Put up again thy sword."

(DONATISTS.)

Towards the close of the fourth century, some of the followers of Donatus, who were much embroiled with the Romanists, armed themselves with *clubs* instead of *swords*, because Jesus Christ had forbidden the use of the sword to St. Peter.

They were so expert with these clubs, as to be able to destroy life at a single blow.

See Dictionn. des Hérésies.

MATTHEW xxvii. 32.

"His cross."

No. 1.

In the fourth century, Helena, the mother of Constantine, was reported, on her visit to the holy sepulchre, to have discovered the cross of Christ. Whatever may be the real history of this transaction, whether any discovery was really made, or whether Helena was a dupe or an associate in finding out this treasure; thus much is certain, that pieces of this precious wood were distributed throughout the

Christian world, and the cross, according to the testimony of St. Paulinus, containing a vital virtue in an inanimate and insensible substance, yielded and continued to yield almost daily, its precious wood to the desires of an infinite number of persons without suffering any diminution, or appearance of having been touched.

Tillemont Hist. Eccles. lib. vii. c. 5.

No. 2.

The custom of making the sign of the cross probably originated in its having been a mark of distinction during the season of persecution between the Christians and Heathens; or to convince their enemies that they were not ashamed of a circumstance for which they were continually reproached.

Gregory's History of the Christian Church.

No. 3.

By the advice of the Patriarch Nikon, Alexis Michaelowich, father of Peter the Great, condemned those who would not make the sign of the cross with three fingers, to have their hands cut off; hence arose a schism. These schismatics would not admit either the translation of the sacred books by Nikon, or his new litanies; and even now they would rather lose their head, than not make the sign of the cross with two fingers, as a symbol that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father alone.

Secret Memoirs of the Court of St. Petersburg, vol. ii. p. 85.

MATTHEW xxvii. 40.

“If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross.”

At the commencement of the sixth century, the following questions excited much controversy.

“Whether it could be said, with propriety, that *one of the Trinity* suffered on the cross? Whether *the person* of Christ could be considered as *compounded?*”

See Norisii Historia Controversiæ de uno ex Trinitate Passo, tom. iii. p. 771.

The ancient writers who mention this controversy, call the Monks who set it on foot, Scythians. But La Croze, in his Thesaur. Epist. tom. iii. p. 179. imagines, that the country of these Monks was Egypt, and not Scythia.



MATTHEW xxvii. 54.

“Truly this was a Son of God.”—Wakefield and Unitarian Version.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“The centurion was probably a Heathen, and therefore would regard Christ as a Son of one of their numerous deities. ‘The Son of God,’ in Jewish phraseology, signified the Messiah. See Matth. xvi. 16. Luke xxiii. 47. where the language of the centurion is ‘certainly this was a righteous man’.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

MATTHEW xxvii. 60.

“He laid it in his own new tomb.”

The tomb of our Saviour was held in great esteem and was resorted to by crowds of pious visitors, who carried away with them large portions of *holy earth* which was highly esteemed.

Gregory's History of the Christian Church.

MATTHEW xxviii. 18.

“All power is given unto me.”

(UNITARIANISM.)

“All, is often used in a limited sense, as cap. xi. 23, shews it is here. Also in John xvi. 30, &c.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

MATTHEW xxviii. 19.

“Go ye therefore and teach all nations baptizing them,” &c.

No. 1.

(QUAKERS.)

This passage, as well as Mark xvi. 16, the Quakers apply to an inward and spiritual baptism.

Mr. Tuke observes, “that this construction is much corroborated by rendering the former passage as the Greek implies ‘into the name, &c.’ By this expression, we (the Quakers) understand, the introducing of the believers into a feeling sense of the power of God in Christ by the influence of the Holy Spirit.

“This application of the word ‘name,’ as symbolical of the Divine Power, (see the Concordance)

of Cruden and Taylor; under the word ‘name,’) is not uncommon in Holy Writ.

“Thus the expressions of our Lord unite with those of the Apostle Paul. ‘So many as were baptized into Christ Jesus, were baptized into his death,’ Rom. vi. 3. ‘As many as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.’ Gal. iii. 27.

“That these expressions have no allusion to water baptism, appears to us evident from the context; and particularly from the following expression of the same Apostle, ‘By one spirit are we all baptized into one body, and have been all made to drink into one spirit.’ 1 Cor. xii. 13.”

The Quakers admit, that the Apostles made use of baptism with water.

(See Note on Matt. iii. 11.)

“*Into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*”
Unitarian Version.

No. 2. (UNITARIANISM.)

“As a symbolical profession of that holy religion which originated with the Father, was taught by Christ the Son, that is, the Servant and Messenger of God, and confirmed by the gifts of the Holy Spirit. Some have called in question the genuineness of this verse, but perhaps without sufficient authority. It is, however, evident, that it is not intended to prescribe an invariable formula in the administration of baptism; for the Apostles themselves baptized simply into the name of Jesus. See Acts viii. 16. xix. 5. x. 48. That the Holy Spirit is here named in connection with the Father and the Son, is no proof that the Spirit has a distinct per-

sonal existence. See Acts xx. 32.; Eph. vi. 10. Much less can this phraseology be alleged as an argument, that the three names express three Divine and equal Persons. See 1 Chron. xxix. 20. Some would render the passage *upon*, or *concerning*, the name, &c. that is, receiving them to instruction upon these subjects. See Cappe's Dissertations."

Note to the Unitarian Version.



MATTHEW xxviii. 20.

"I am with you always," &c.

No. 1.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

"How," say the Roman Catholics, "could our Church ever go astray; having always with her pastors, as is here promised, Christ himself, who is the 'way, the truth, and the life.' St. John xiv. 6."

See Note to the Roman Catholic Version.



"Lo! I am with you always to the end of the age."

Wakefield and Unitarian Version.

No. 2.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"To the end of the age, i. e. to the end of the Jewish dispensation till the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple; soon after which, miraculous powers were withdrawn, and no personal appearances of Jesus Christ are recorded."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

ST. MARK.

MARK i. 9.

"Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptised of John in Jordan."

No. 1.

(Gnostics.)

The Egyptian Gnostics blended into one mass the Oriental Philosophy and the Egyptian Theology; the former of which the Asiatics preserved unmixed in its original simplicity.

The Egyptians were, moreover, particularly distinguished from the Asiatic Gnostics, by the following difference in their religious system, viz. 1. That though, besides the existence of a Deity, they maintained that also of an eternal matter, endued with life and motion; yet they did not acknowledge an eternal principle of darkness, or the evil principle of the Persians. 2. They supposed that our blessed Saviour was a compound of two persons—of the Man Jesus, and of Christ the Son of God: that the Divine Nature entered into the Man Jesus when he was baptized by John in the River Jordan, and departed from him when he was seized by the Jews. 3. They attributed to Christ a real, not an imaginary body; though it must be confessed, that they were much divided in their sentiments on this head. 4. Their discipline, with respect to life and manners, was much less severe than those of the Asiatic sect;

and seems, in some points, to have been favourable to the corruptions and passions of men.

Mosheim.

No. 2.

(THE RUSSIAN GREEK CHURCH.)

In the Greek Church there are two offices for the benediction or sanctification of the water, called in the Euchologion “the office of the lesser sanctification,” which may be performed at any time when there is a want of holy water for baptism, or any other use of the Church, and the office of the great sanctification which is celebrated on the holy Theophany, or Epiphany, in memory of the baptism of Christ; by which the Greeks believe, that the nature of all waters is sanctified; and that such virtue remains in them after this ceremony, that those taken in the night, when the service is performed in the Church, will remain uncorrupted for years, and be as fresh water just taken from the spring or river. This appears from St. Chrysostom’s Homily on the Baptism of Christ; whence we may learn the antiquity of this ceremony, and that it was originally performed at the Mesonyction or Midnight Service, which seems to be universally admitted. In Russia, this service is joined with the Liturgy of St. Basil, in the evening, on the vigil of the Epiphany (6th January) when the Pernoctation is performed, and again repeated after the Liturgy on the following morning, at which, in St. Petersburg, the Sovereign and the whole Court assist, and walk in procession with the Clergy.

A description of the manner in which this solemnity is annually celebrated at St. Petersburg, is given by Dr. King and by Mr. Chantreau, from both

Which, that here presented to the reader, is chiefly collected. On the River Neva, upon the ice, which is then strong in that country, there is erected for this ceremony, a kind of temple of wood, usually of an octagonal figure, painted and richly gilt, having the inside decorated with various sacred pictures, representing the baptism of our Saviour, his transfiguration, and some other parts of his life, and on the top a picture of St. John the Baptist. This is called the Jordan, which name used to signify the baptistry, or font, or any basin in which holy water is consecrated. There the attention of the spectators is drawn to a large emblem of the Holy Ghost, appearing to descend from heaven, a decoration common to almost all the Greek Churches, in which a “*peristerion*” or dove, as a symbol of the Holy Ghost, is usually suspended from four small columns which support a canopy over the holy table. The Jordan is surrounded by a temporary hedge of the boughs of fir-trees; and in the middle of the sanctuary or chancel, is a square space, where the broken ice leaves a communication with the water running below, and the rest is ornamented with rich tapestry. Around this temple a kind of gallery is erected, and a platform of boards, covered with red cloth, is laid for the procession to go upon, guarded also by a fence of boughs. The gallery communicates with one of the windows of the imperial palace, at which the Emperor and his family come out to attend the ceremony, which begins as soon as the Liturgy is finished in the chapel of the Imperial Palace, and the regiments of guards have taken post on the river. Then, at the sound of the bells, and of the artillery of the fortress, the clerks, the Deacons, the Priests, the Archimandrites, and the

Bishops, dressed in their richest robes, carrying in their hands lighted tapers, the censer, the Gospel, and the sacred pictures and banners, proceed from the chapel to the Jordan, singing the hymns appointed in the office, and followed by the Emperor, the Grand Duke, the Senators, and the whole Court.

When arrived at the palace where the ice is broken, the Archbishop of Moscow, or other officiating Bishop, descends, by means of a ladder, to the side of the water. There he reads the prayer appointed in the office, dips his cross three times, and ends the ceremony by an exhortation appropriate to it; and the waters are then thought to be blessed. As soon as the service is finished, the artillery and soldiers fire: after which, the prelate sprinkles the water on the company around, and on the colours of all the regiments that happen to be at St. Petersburg, which are planted round the Jordan. He then retires; when the people crowd towards the hole, and drink of the waters with a holy avidity. Notwithstanding the cold, the mothers plunge their infants, and the old men their heads, into them. Every body makes it a duty to carry away some for the purification of their houses, and curing certain distempers, against which the Russians hold this holy water to be a powerful specific.

See Dr. King's Rites and Ceremonies, and Adam's Religious World.

MARK i. 13.

“ There in the wilderness.”

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ The words, ‘ there in the desert,’ are omitted by Newcome; the whole was a visionary scene.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

MARK v. 2.

“A man with an unclean spirit.”

(UNITARIANISM.)

“This man was raving mad, and imagined himself possessed by a legion of demons, whose organ he was compelled to be. When healed, he is said, ver. 15, to be in his right mind; which implies, that his disorder was insanity. See Farmer on Demon. p. 100.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.



MARK vi. 13.

“Anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them.”

It is said to have been generally believed, during the sixth century, that the oil taken from the lamps which burned at the tombs of the martyrs, had a supernatural efficacy to sanctify its possessors, and to defend them from all dangers, both of a temporal and spiritual nature.

See the *list of sacred oils* which Gregory the Great sent Queen Theudelinda, in the work of Ruinartus, intitled, *Acta Martyrum sincera et selecta*, p. 619.

(See Notes on James v. 14.)



MARK ix. 2.

(See Note on Matt. xvii. 1.)

MARK ix. 4.

“ *Moses.* ”

(UNITABIANISM.)

(See Note on Matt. xvii. 3.)

MARK ix. 48.

“ *Where their worm dieth not,* ” &c.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ These are metaphors expressing the effects of divine indignation. In the Old Testament they are used to express temporal calamities and death, Isa. xxxiv. 2—16. xlvii. 14.; Jer. vii. 20.; Ezek. xx. 47, 48. In the New Testament, therefore, the similar phrases must in their strongest sense be understood, of grievous suffering terminated by death, which Christ will finally abolish: which therefore will not be eternal, 1 Cor. xv. 54; 2 Tim. i. 10. Simpson’s Notes, MS.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

MARK xiii. 32.

“ *Not the Angels *, neither the Son †.* ”

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ * Or messengers, i. e. prophets. In ver. 27, the apostles are called angels.”

“ † Ambrose cites MSS. which omit this clause and complains that it was introduced by the Arians. But all manuscripts and versions now extant retain

it, and it is cited by early writers. It proves that Christ is not God, because his knowledge is limited, nor can it be inferred from the climax that he is a superangelic being. All the instruments by which divine providence executes its purposes are called angels. And angels are represented as ministers of Christ, and subject to his orders at the destruction of Jerusalem. Prophets are said to do what they are commissioned to predict. See Jer. i. 10. Thus Christ is said to have destroyed Jerusalem, and angels are represented as acting under him, when perhaps nothing more is intended, than that Christ predicted the event which God in the course of his providence brought to pass."

Notes to the Unitarian Version.

MARK xvi. 9.

" Out of whom he had cast many devils."

(UNITARIANISM.)

" i. e. whom Jesus had cured of raving madness. So Celsus understood the expression. See Farmer on Dem. p. 105."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

MARK xvi. 16.

" He that believeth and is baptized," &c.

(QUAKERS.)

(See Notes on Matt. xxviii. 19, and Matt. iii. 11.)

MARK xvi. 19.

“ Right hand of God.”

(ARDÆUS.)

Ardæus, who lived in the fourth century, attributed to the Deity a human form.

I. I. Schroder, Dissert. de Ardæanis.

ST. LUKE.

LUKE i. 4.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“THE remaining verses of this, and the whole of the second chapter, are of doubtful authority: for though they are to be found in all manuscripts and versions which are now extant, yet the following considerations have induced many to doubt whether they were really written by Luke.

“ 1. The evangelist expressly affirms that Jesus had entered upon, or, as Grotius understands it, had completed his thirtieth year, in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar, chap. iii. 1. 23. See Grot. in loc. He must therefore have been born fifteen years before the death of Augustus, A. U. C. 752 or 753: but the latest period assigned for the death of Herod is in the spring of A. U. C. 751, and he died probably the year before. See Lardner's Works, vol. i. p. 423—428, and Jones's Developement of Facts, vol. i. p. 365. 368. Herod therefore must have been dead upwards of two years before Christ was born. A fact which invalidates the whole narration, and makes it impossible that the writer of

the history should have been the writer of the preliminary chapters.

“2. The first and second chapters of this gospel were wanting in the copies used by Marcion, a reputed heretic, who flourished very early in the second century. His gospel was undoubtedly that of Luke, though he does not mention the Evangelist's name: and he maintains its antiquity, authenticity, and integrity. Marcion was one of those, who being ashamed of the simplicity of the Gospel, blended it with the wild speculations of an erroneous philosophy. But his character was unimpeached even by his bitterest enemies, till it was calumniated by Epiphanius two hundred years after his death. He is accused by his enemies of mutilating and corrupting the Scriptures. The falsehood of many of the charges alleged by Epiphanius is exposed by Dr. Lardner. But at any rate, it would be the most egregious trifling to argue that those who appeal to the testimony of Marcion in a particular case, are bound to follow him in all the eccentricities of his opinions.

“3. The Evangelist, in his preface to the history of the Acts of the Apostles, reminds his friend Theophilus, Acts i. 1, that his former history contained an account of the public ministry of Jesus, but makes no allusion to the remarkable incidents contained in the two first chapters: which therefore probably were not written by him.

“4. If the account of the miraculous conception of Jesus be true, he could not be the offspring of David and Abraham, from whom it was predicted, and by the Jews expected, that the Messiah should descend.

“5. There is no allusion to any of those extrap-

ordinary facts in either of the succeeding histories of Luke, or in any other books of the New Testament. Jesus is uniformly spoken of as the Son of Joseph and Mary, and as a native of Nazareth, and no expectation whatever appears to have been excited in the public mind by these wonderful and notorious events.

“ 6. The style of the two first chapters is different from the rest of the history; the date of the enrolment, chap. ii. 1, 2, is a great historical difficulty; that John the Baptist should have been ignorant of the person of Christ, is not probable, if this narrative be true, John i. 31, 34. And there are many other circumstances in the story which wear an improbable and fabulous aspect.”

Evanson's Disson. chap. i. sect. 3. p. 57.

(See likewise the Note upon the two first chapters of Matthew, and the references there.)

— “ It has, however, been alleged, that the narrative of Luke does not necessarily imply the miraculous conception, and consequently, that the prefatory chapters to this Gospel may stand, though those in Matthew were given up. And much ingenuity has been displayed in explaining Luke i. 26—38, consistently with this hypothesis. To which it seems sufficient to reply, that the words have hitherto been universally understood as plainly asserting the miraculous conception of Jesus Christ, and that no other interpretation was heard of, for seventeen hundred years. A sense so novel, therefore, is not likely to be the true meaning of the passage. At any rate, the chronological difficulty remains the same; and the fabulous circumstances, such as a host of angels singing in the air, &c. &c. give a cast of improba-

bility to the whole narrative. See Dr. Carpenter's *Unitarianism the Doctrine of the Gospel*, Ed. 2. p. 353.

“ It has been objected, that so large and gross an interpolation could not have escaped detection, and would never have been so early and generally received.

“ In reply to this objection it is observed, that this interpolation was not admitted into the Hebrew copies of Matthew's gospel, nor into Marcion's copies of Luke : that it is notorious, that forged writings, under the names of the Apostles, were in circulation almost from the apostolic age. See 2 Thess. ii. 2. That the orthodox charge the heretics with corrupting the text ; and that the heretics recriminate upon the orthodox : also that it was much easier to introduce interpolations when copies were few and scarce, than since they have been multiplied to so great a degree by means of the press : and finally, that the interpolation in question would, to the generality of Christians, be extremely gratifying, as it would lessen the odium attached to Christianity, from its founder being a crucified Jew, and would elevate him to the dignity of the heroes and demigods of the heathen mythology.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

LUKE i. 28.

“ *Blessed art thou,*” &c.

No. 1.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

The dignity and pre-eminence which the Roman Catholics ascribe to the Virgin Mary, are founded on these passages.

For her veneration and invocation consult what is said of angels and saints.

(See Notes on Luke i. 48.)

No. 2.

Pope John XXII. ordered Christians to add to their prayers those words with which the angel Gabriel saluted the Virgin Mary.

Mosheim.

LUKE i. 48.

“ Shall call me blessed.”

No. 1.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

“ These words are a prediction of that honour which the Church of all ages should pay to the blessed Virgin. Let Protestants examine whether they are any way concerned in this prophecy.”

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

No. 2.

(THE ROSARY AND CROWN.)

Towards the conclusion of the tenth century a custom was introduced among the Latins of celebrating masses, and abstaining from flesh, in honour of the blessed Virgin, every Sabbath-day. After this, was instituted, what the Latins called the lesser office, in honour of St. Mary, which was, in the following century, confirmed by Urban II. in the Council of Clermont. There are also to be found in this age manifest indications of the institution of the rosary and crown of the Virgin; by which her

worshippers were to reckon the number of prayers they were to offer her. The rosary consists in fifteen repetitions of the Lord's Prayer, and an hundred and fifty salutations of the blessed Virgin ; while the crown consists in six or seven repetitions of the Lord's Prayer, and six or seven times ten salutations or Ave Marias.

Mabillon Præf. ad acta S. S. Ord. Bened. Sæc. v. p. 58.

No. 3.

“ The fifteen mysteries to be meditated upon in saying the rosary.”

The five *joyful* mysteries. 1. The annunciation of the angel Gabriel, and the incarnation of the Son of God in the womb of the blessed Virgin. 2. The visitation of St. Elizabeth. 3. The nativity or birth of our Lord. 4. The presentation of our Lord in the temple, and the purification of his blessed mother. 5. His being found in the temple in the midst of the doctors, after having been lost three days by his mother and her chaste spouse St. Joseph.

The five *dolorous* or sorrowful mysteries. 1. The prayer of our Lord in the garden, with his agony and sweat of blood. 2. His being scourged at the pillar. 3. His being crowned with thorns and abused by the soldiers. 4. His carriage of the cross. 5. His crucifixion and death.

The five *glorious* mysteries. 1. The resurrection of our Lord. 2. His ascension into heaven. 3. The coming down of the Holy Ghost. 4. The assumption of the blessed Virgin. 5. Her eternal felicity, and that of all the blessed in the kingdom of heaven.

See The Garden of the Soul, or Manual of Spiritual Exercises and Instructions for the Roman Catholics.

No. 4.

(THE CONFITEOR.)

I confess to Almighty God, to blessed Mary ever Virgin, to blessed *Michael* the archangel, to blessed *John* the Baptist, to the holy apostles *Peter* and *Paul*, and to all the saints, that I have sinned exceedingly in thought, word, and deed, through my fault, through my most grievous fault: therefore, I beseech the blessed *Mary* ever Virgin, the blessed *Michael* the archangel, the blessed *John* the Baptist, the holy apostles *Peter* and *Paul*, and all the saints, to pray to the Lord our God for me.

May the Almighty God have mercy on me, and forgive me my sins, and bring me to life everlasting. Amen.

May the Almighty and merciful Lord give me pardon, absolution, and remission of all my sins. Amen.

See The Garden of the Soul, or Manual of Spiritual Exercises and Instructions for the Roman Catholics.

LUKE ii. 2.

“Now this first registering was when Cyrenius was Governor of Syria.”—Wakefield.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“Which he never was in the time of Herod, and consequently the whole story is a fabrication. Archbishop Newcome, to avoid this consequence, adopts Lardner’s version of the text: ‘This was the first enrolment of Cyrenius, afterwards governor of Syria.’ Lard. Cred. ii. 723; a version which would never have been thought of, had it not been to save a

hypothesis. That in the text is Mr. Wakefield's. Bishop Chandler and Mr. Bowyer thought the sentence an interpolation. See Newcome's note."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

—
LUKE ii. 12.

"And this shall be a sign unto you, ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger."

(SWADDLERS.)

It happened that Cennick, a disciple of Wesley, preaching on Christmas-day in Ireland, took these words for his text. A Catholic, who was present, thought this so ludicrous, that he called the preacher a swaddler in derision; and this unmeaning word became the nickname of the Methodists, and had all the effect of the most opprobrious appellation.

Southey's Life of Wesley.

—
LUKE ii. 22.

"And when the days of her purification," &c.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"The time fixed by law for this ceremony, was thirty-three days after the birth. See Lev. xii. 4. They brought him to Jerusalem, therefore they were not afraid of Herod. They returned, ver. 39, to Nazareth, not to Bethlehem; consequently the wise men from the East did not visit Jesus at Bethlehem. They returned to Nazareth, because it was *their own city*: and not as the pretended Matthew says; because they were warned in a dream, and to fulfil a prophecy which does not exist. Matt. ii. 23—

Finally, they went up every year to Jerusalem, at the passover, ver. 41; therefore they did not go down into Egypt. Hence it follows, that both the accounts cannot be true; and, in fact, neither of them is worthy of credit."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

LUKE iii. 23.

"Began to be about thirty years of age."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"This is Mr. Wakefield's translation, *Ἀρχομαι ὡν ἔτων τριακοντα*, est, incipio jam esse tricenarius, Grotius; who observes, that this expression can only be used of one who has finished his thirtieth year: circiter, may be understood of one who is something more than thirty years of age, as well as of one who is under that age. This was the age appointed by law for the Levites to enter upon their office. Numb. iv. 3. 47. The primate's version is, 'Jesus himself was about thirty years of age when he began *his ministry*.' And Dr. Campbell renders the passage 'Now Jesus was himself about thirty years in subjection.' Whichsoever of these versions may be approved, it appears from the uncommon accuracy with which Luke dates his history, that in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius, our Lord, then entering upon his ministry, was no more than thirty years of age. And, therefore, he must have been born at least two years and nine months, and probably three years and nine months after the death of Herod. The common hypothesis, which makes it necessary to maintain, that Jesus was nearly five and thirty when the Evangelist declares

that he was no more than thirty, can never be supported by any principles of sound criticism. Lardner's Works, Vol. i. p. 428."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

LUKE iv. 2.

"Tempted of the devil."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"A visionary scene, supernaturally presented to the mind of Christ, to instruct him in the proper use of his miraculous powers. See Note on Matt. iv. 1."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

LUKE iv. 9.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"As thou art a Son of God."—Wakefield.

"If thou be a Son of God."—Note to the Unitarian Version.

LUKE iv. 33.

"A man that had a spirit."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"He was raving mad, and fancied himself possessed by a demon; which was the current opinion of the age. He believed, as many then did, that

Jesus was the Messiah, or a great Prophet, and addresses him as such; and Jesus replies to him in the popular language, in conformity to the ideas and feelings of the maniac. See Farmer on Demon. c. 2. sect. 1."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

LUKE viii. 2.

"Out of whom went seven devils."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"Who had been cured of raving insanity. There is no reason to believe that Mary Magdalene had ever been either a gentile or an immoral person. Lardner, vol. xi. 253."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

LUKE viii. 27.

"A certain man which had devils."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"This demoniac had, probably, intervals of reason; but often, see ver. 29, he had violent paroxysms of insanity, which made it necessary for his friends to bind him: though it seems that he sometimes escaped from his keepers. He fancied himself possessed by a legion of demons, and talks to Jesus as a raving lunatic. See Farmer on Demoniacs, c. ii. sect. 1. Mr. Evanson suspects the whole account to be an interpolation, particularly from the use of a Latin word in Greek characters, which, he observes,

is not customary with Luke, nor with any writer in the Apostolic age. *Evanson's Dissonance*, chap. i. sect. 1."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

LUKE ix. 30.

"Moses."

(See Note on Matt. xvii. 3.)

LUKE ix. 39.

"And lo a spirit taketh him."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"This was evidently a case of epilepsy."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

LUKE ix. 56.

"For the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them."

This passage is omitted in the Unitarian Version.

LUKE xv. 10.

*"There shall be joy before the angels * of God upon one sinner doing penance."*—Roman Catholic Version.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

" Before the Angels.—By this it is plain, that the spirits in heaven have a concern for us below;*

and a joy at our repentance, and consequently a knowledge of it."

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

LUKE xvi. 9.

"They may receive you," &c.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

"By this we see that the poor servants of God, whom we have relieved by our alms, may hereafter, by their intercession, bring our souls to heaven."

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

LUKE xvi. 22.

"Abraham's bosom."

No. 1.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

"The place of rest, where the souls of the saints resided till Christ had opened heaven by his death."

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

No. 2.

Some new doctrines, concerning the *state of the soul* after death, appear to have made a considerable progress during the third century.

The undistinguished believer was consigned to purification and the expiation of his sins in a state after this life, and anterior to his participation of the joys of heaven; but the Martyrs were supposed to be received to eternal glory immediately upon the dissolution of the body. The annual commemoration of their sufferings and victory was solemnly

and fervently observed in the church. In compliance with the superstition of their Pagan brethren, and with a view to recommend themselves to their favour, the Christians appointed the celebration of these anniversaries on the days* appropriated to Pagan festivals.

No. 3.

The famous yearly festival which was celebrated in remembrance of *all departed souls*, was instituted by the authority of Odilo, Abbot of Clugni, and added to the Latin Calendar in the year 998. Before this time, a custom had been introduced in many places of putting up prayers, on certain days, for the souls that were confined in purgatory; but these prayers were made by each religious society, only for its own members, friends, and patrons.

Odilo, however, extended the benefit of those prayers to all souls who laboured under the pains and trials of purgatory. This proceeding of Odilo was owing to the exhortations of a certain Sicilian Hermit, who asserted, that he had learned, by an immediate revelation from heaven, that the prayers of the Monks of Clugni would be effectual for the deliverance of departed spirits from the expiatory flames of a middle state. Accordingly, this festival was, at first, celebrated only by the congregation of Clugni; but having received afterwards the approbation of one of the Roman Pontiffs, it was, by his order, kept with particular devotion in all the Latin Churches.

Mabillon, Acta, S. S. Ord. Bened. Sæc. vi. p. 584.

* Greg. Nysson's Opera, vol. ii. p. 1006.

No. 4. (ORIGEN.)

Origen asserted the pre-existence of souls, which he considered as sent into mortal bodies, for the punishment of sins committed in a former state of being.

Maclaine's Note.

No. 5. (ANABAPTISTS.)

The Anabaptists maintained, that departed souls continue in a kind of sleep till the resurrection.

See Mosheim.

No. 6. (WESLEY.)

“ Let us consider,” said Wesley, “ what may be the employment of unholy Spirits from death to the resurrection. We cannot doubt, but the moment they leave the body, they find themselves surrounded by spirits of their own kind, probably human as well as diabolical. What power God may permit these to exercise over them, we do not distinctly know. But it is not improbable, he may suffer Satan to employ them as he does his own angels, in inflicting death or evils of various kinds, on the men that know not God. For this end, they may raise storms by sea or by land; they may shoot meteors through the air; they may occasion earthquakes, and in numberless ways, afflict those whom they are not suffered to destroy. Where they are not permitted to take away life, they may inflict various diseases: and many of these, which we may judge to be natural, are undoubtedly diabolical. I believe this is frequently the case with lunatics. It is observable,

that many of these, mentioned in Scripture, who are called lunatics by one of the Evangelists, are termed demoniacs by another."

See vol. ii. p. 31.

LUKE xvi. 23.

"In hell he lift up his eyes, being in torment."

(IRENÆUS AND ORIGEN.)

Irenæus, quoting this parable, affirmed, that after death, the soul had a body conjoined with it, and that of the same *form* and *figure* with that body which it had before here in this life.

Origen was of the same persuasion, that *souls* after *death* had certain *subtile bodies* united to them, and that those bodies of theirs had the same εἶδος χαρακτηρίζον "characterizing form," which these their terrestrial bodies before had. This, he thought, might be sufficiently proved from the frequent apparitions of ghosts or departed souls.

Cudworth, p. 802.

(See Note on Luke xxiv. 39.)

LUKE xx. 36.

"Neither can they die any more, for they are equal unto the Angels."

(ST. AUSTIN.)

According to St. Austin's interpretation of this passage, the souls of good men, after the resurrection shall have corpora angelica "angelic bodies,"

and qualia sunt angelorum corpora, “such bodies as those of angels are.”

See Cudworth.

LUKE xxii. 18.

“I will not drink of the wine, until the kingdom of God shall come.”

(MILLENARIANS.)

The Millenarians supposed that Christ here alluded to the wine he should drink with his Saints during the reign of a thousand years.

(See Note on Rev. xx. 4.)

LUKE xxii. 31.

“Satan hath desired to have you,” &c.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“As the account in Job is to be understood allegorically, and not literally, so likewise is this.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

LUKE xxii. 43, 44.

“And there appeared an Angel,” &c.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“These verses are wanting in the Vatican, the Alexandrian, and other manuscripts, and are marked as doubtful in some in which they are inserted.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

LUKE xxiii. 43.

“ To day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.”

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ In the state of the virtuous dead, who, though in their graves, are alive to God. *Σήμερον* is used to denote, not the exact time, but the certainty that an event will take place, Deut. ix. 1. comp. Josh. i. 1, 2. 10, 11. iii. 1—5.; 1 Sam. xv. 28. comp. 31; also, Ps. ii. 7.; Acts xiii. 33; Heb. i. 5. This verse was wanted in the copies of Marcion and other reputed heretics; and in some of the older copies in the time of Origen; nor is cited either by Justin, Irenæus, or Tertullian: though the two former have quoted almost every text in Luke which relates to the crucifixion; and Tertullian wrote concerning the intermediate state. See Evanson’s Diss. p. 28.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.



LUKE xxiv. 31.

“ And he vanished out of their sight.”

As for our Saviour Christ’s body, after his resurrection, and before his ascension; which, notwithstanding its solidity in handling, yet sometimes vanished also out of his disciples sight; this probably, as Origen conceived, was purposely conserved for a time, in a certain *middle state*, betwixt the crassities of a mortal body, and the spirituality of a perfectly glorified, heavenly and ethereal body.

(See notes on Luke xvi. 23, xxiv. 39.)

Cudworth, p. 804.

LUKE xxiv. 39.

“ A Spirit hath not flesh and bones.”

(ORIGEN.)

Speaking of apparitions, Origen says, “ These apparitions of the dead are not mere groundless imaginations, but they proceed from souls themselves, really remaining and surviving after death, and subsisting in that which is called a luciform body.” Origen farther tells us, “ That the thing which St. Thomas the apostle disbelieved, was not our Saviour’s appearing after death, as if he had thought it impossible *for ghosts or souls departed, visibly to appear*, but only his rising and appearing in that same solid body, which had been before crucified, and was laid in the sepulchre. Thomas also, as well as the other apostles, assented to the woman affirming that she had seen Jesus, as not thinking it at all impossible, for the soul of a dead man to be seen, but he did not believe him to have risen and appeared, in that self-same solid body, in which he lived before.”

See Cudworth, p. 803.

ST. JOHN.

JOHN i. 1.

“ The Word was with God.”

No. 1.

(ARIUS.)

Athanasius affirms, that Arius maintained there was another Word, and Wisdom, senior to that Word, and Wisdom in our Saviour Christ.

Cudworth, p. 575.

No. 2.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ In the beginning was Wisdom, and Wisdom was with God, and Wisdom was God.”—Wakefield’s Translation.

“ Wisdom, or reason, ὁ λογος. My authority for this translation is Solomon, Prov. viii. 1. 22—32, and the Son of Sirach, i. 1—6, whom I think no man can possibly deny to be speaking of the very same thing as our Evangelist. That by this λογος of John is meant the word of God, so frequent in the Chaldee Targums, and the mens, ratio, et sapientia, the mind, reason, and wisdom, of the Greek and Roman

philosophers and poets, and of the Christian Fathers, is a point, which seems to myself at least, very clearly proved in p. 102, and the following pages, of my Enquiry into the Opinions of the Christian Writers. In further confirmation, however, of so important a variation from the common version, and which is liable to so much misconstruction and censure, I shall subjoin some further passages from different authors, in this place, also.

“ Let the reader consult the targum of Onkelos on Gen. viii. 21, the Jerusalem targum on Gen. xxii. 4, that of Jonathan on Jer. xxx. 20, and the targums on Levit. xxvi. 46, Amos vi. 8, and compare this last with Heb. vi. 13. Now will any man assert that these writers regarded the *word of God* as a *distinct Being* from *God himself*? I suppose not.

“ Monilius says,

“ Hic igitur Deus et Ratio, quæ cuncta gubernat. Λογος εστιν εικων θεου, δι’ ού συμπας ο κοσμος εδημιουργειτο. Phil. Jud. p. 823, ed. Lut. Compare 2 Cor. iv. 4.

“ Ο του θεου νους και λογος—εις γενεσιν—προηλθε. Plut. de Is. et Os. and again de Orac. Def. Αρχοντα πρωτον και ηγεμονα του ολου θεον εχοντα και νουν και λογον.

“ Νους τοινυν ηγεμων και βασιλευς των οντων, τεχνη δημιουργικη του παντος, τοις θεοις ωσαντως αιει παρεστι. Jamb. de Myst. i. 7. and again viii. 3. Ο δημιουργικος νους—της αληθειας προστατης και σοφιας, and elsewhere.

“ Ο θεος—την ουσιαν—εταξε—λογον εγκαταστησας ωπερ αρμοστην και φυλακα. Plut. This mode of expression was so frequent, that John could not have employed more intelligible language in describing the operations of the *Supreme Being*.

“ The same author says also : Ταυτον εστι το επεσθαι θεω και το πειθεσθαι λογω.

“ Θεός ἐστιν ἀθάνατος νους, παλυδιουκητον πνευμα, φως, νους, δυναμις. Secundus Philosophus.

“ So that I feel no difficulty in asserting, in the most explicit and unqualified language, that no man, acquainted with the writings of the ancients, who came to the reading of St. John’s Gospel, would ever have found his *Arian* or *Trinitarian* doctrine there, if he had not come prepared, with his strange ideas, to these Scriptures.

“ His interpretation equally violates all sober philology, and the uniform usage of other writers.”

Wakefield.

“ *In the beginning was Wisdom, and Wisdom was with God, and God was Wisdom.*”—Lindsey’s Translation.

“ *The Word was in the beginning *, and the Word was with God †, and the Word was a God ‡.*”—Unitarian Version.

“ * *In the beginning* ; or from the first ; i. e. from the commencement of the Gospel dispensation, or of the ministry of Christ. This is the usual sense of the word in the writings of this evangelist. John vi. 64, Jesus knew from the beginning, or from the first ; chap. xv. 27, “ Ye have been with me from the beginning.” See ch. xvi. 14. ii. 24. iii. 11. also 1 John i. 1. ii. 7, 8. ; 2 John vi. 7. Nor is this sense of the word uncommon in other passages of the New Testament. 2 Thess. ii. 13. ; Phil. iv. 15. ; Luke i. 2.

“ † *The Word was with God* ; He withdrew from the world to commune with God, and to receive divine instructions and qualifications previously to his public ministry. As Moses was with God in the mount, Exod. xxxiv. 28, so was Christ in the wilderness, or elsewhere, to be instructed and disciplined for his high and important office. See Cappe’s Dissert. p. 22.

“ † *The Word was a God*; Jesus received a commission as a prophet of the Most High, and was invested with extraordinary miraculous powers. But in the Jewish phraseology they were called Gods to whom the word of God came. John x. 35. So Moses is declared to be a God to Pharaoh. Exod. vii. 1. Some translate the passage, God was the word, q. d. it was not so properly he that spake to men, as God that spake to them by him. Capp, *ibid.* See John x. 30, compared with xvii. 8. 11. 16. iii. 34. 23. xii. 44. Crellius conjectured, that the true reading was Θεου, the word was God's, q. d. the first teacher of the Gospel derived his commission from God. But this conjecture, however plausible, rests upon no authority.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

JOHN i. 2.

“ *Was in the beginning with God.*”

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ Before he entered upon his ministry, he was fully instructed by intercourse with God in the nature and extent of his commission.”

Note to the Unitarian Version!

JOHN i. 3.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ *All things were made by it, and without it was nothing made.*”

Lindsey and Wakefield's Translation.

“ *All things were done by him, and without him was not any thing done that hath been done.*”—Unitarian Version.

“ *All things were done by him.* Γινομαι occurs upwards of seven hundred times in the New Testa-

ment; but never in the sense of *create*. It signifies in this Gospel, where it occurs fifty-three times, to be, to come, to become, to come to pass; also to be done or transacted, chap. xv. 7. xix. 36. It has the latter sense, Matt. v. 18. vi. 8. xxi. 42. xxvi. 6. All things in the Christian dispensation were done by Christ, i. e. by his authority, and according to his direction; and in the ministry committed to his Apostles, nothing has been done without his warrant. See John xv. 4, 5. 'Without me ye can do nothing.' Compare ver. 7. 10. 16.; John xvii. 8.; Col. i. 16, 17. Cappe's Dissertation."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

JOHN i. 4.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"In it was life, and the life was the light of men."

Lindsey's Translation.

"What was made, had life in it; and this life was the light of men."—Wakefield's Translation.

"By him was life."—Unitarian Version.

"Christ was the Revealer of life.—With him were the words of eternal life. John vi. 68.; 1 John v. 11. Hence he is called the 'Word of Life,' 1 John i. 1. 'This Life,' i. e. Jesus who is now called the life, as he was before called the word, 'was the Light of men, the Great Instructor of Mankind'."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

JOHN i. 6.

"A man sent from God."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"This illustrates ver. 1, 2. To be sent from God implies, that he had been first with God. Cappe's Dissert. p. 23."

*Note to the Unitarian Version.**(See the Notes on ver. 1 and 2 of this Chap.)*

JOHN i. 9.

(See Note on Rom. ii. 24.)

JOHN i. 10.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"It (divine wisdom) was in the world, and the world was made by it, and the world knew it not."—Lindsey's Translation.

"This light* was in the world, and the world was made by it, but the world knew it not."—Wakefield's Translation.

"* This light, viz. God; according to James i. 17. and our author himself, 1 Eph. i. 5. So our great poet,"

**"Since God is light
And never but in unapproached light
Dwelt from eternity."**

Wakefield.

"He was in the world*, and the world was enlightened by him †, and yet the world knew him not."—Unitarian Version.

"* He was in the world. He appeared in public as the Prophet and Messenger of God. John xvii. 18. xviii. 37."

"† The world was enlightened by him. 'Ο κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγενετο. The common version adopted by Abp.

Newcome is, 'the world was made by him,' meaning, that 'the visible material world was created by him.' But this, 'as observed before in the note on ver. 3, is inadmissible, as the word *εγενετο* never bears that sense. In the present version *ηεφωτισμενοι*, enlightened, is understood after *εγενετο*, as best connecting with the preceding verse. So ver. 7, a man was sent from God, *εγενετο απεσταλμενος*. And Matt. xxiii. 15, *προσηλυτος* is understood after *γενηται*. Mr. Cappe translates the words 'the world was made for him,' understanding by the world the Jewish dispensation, Gal. iv. 3.; Col. ii. 8. 20. and taking *δια* with a genitive to express the final cause; of which he has produced several remarkable instances. Cappe, p. 50."

Notes to the Unitarian Version.

JOHN i. 11.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"It came to its own land, and its own people received it not."

Lindsey's Translation.

"It came unto its own, but its own received it not."

Wakefield's Translation.

"He came unto his own country, and his countrymen received him not."—Cappe's Translation.

JOHN i. 12.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"But as many as received it, to them it gave power to become the Sons of God, even to them who believe on its name."

Lindsey's Translation.

"But as many as received it, to them it gave a power of becoming children of God, even to the believers on his name."

Wakefield's Translation.

JOHN i. 14.

"The word was made flesh."

No. 1.

(GNOSTICS.)

In direct opposition to these words, the greater part of the Gnostics taught, that Jesus was not incarnate.

They argued, that as Jesus Christ came only to enlighten and instruct men, the appearance of humanity was alone sufficient to accomplish this object.

See Aug. Hær. c. 6.—Epiph. Hær. Tert. Apol. c. 16.

No. 2.

(ORIGEN.)

Origen supposed, that the *soul* of Christ was united to the *word* before the incarnation.

Maclaine's Note.

No. 3.

(BARDESANES.)

Bardesanes maintained, that the union of the soul to a body of flesh was the consequence of the Fall. (See Note on 2 Cor. iv. 4.) hence he concluded, that Jesus Christ had not assumed a human body.

Origen Dial. contr. Marcion.

No. 4.

(EUTYCHIANS.)

About the middle of the fifth century arose the sect of the Eutychians, so called from Eutyches, Abbot of a Monastery near Constantinople.

Eutyches, in direct opposition to the opinions of Nestorius, admitted but one nature in Jesus.

Eutyches would not allow that Jesus was consubstantial with the Father, according to the divine; or with us, according to the human nature.

He asserted, that the human was absorbed by the divine nature, as a drop of water by the sea; or as combustible matter thrown into the furnace is absorbed by the fire.

The followers of Eutyches were afterwards distinguished by the name (besides many others) of Jacobites, who to this day constitute the bulk of those Christians who reside within the jurisdiction of the Bishops of Antioch and Alexandria.

Leo. Ep. 19. Theodor. Ep. 81. p. 955. Apud Theodor. Dial in confusus, Conc. Const. act. 3. See also C. A. Salig. De Eutychianismo ante Eutychen.

No. 5.

(BARSUMAS.)

About the year 460, Barsumas, an Abbot, (whom the reader must be careful not to confound with Barsumas of Nisibis, the famous promoter of the Nestorian doctrines,) spread the Eutychian tenets in Syria; and Samuel, his disciple, propagated them in Armenia.

In Syria, they were somewhat modified by Xenaias of Hierapolis, and Peter the fuller of Antioch: they pretending that there was *one double and compounded nature in Christ*.

The Eutychians split into a multitude of divisions, called Anthropomorphites, Barsanuphites, Esaianists, &c.

They were called also Acephali or Headless, because they had no distinguished chief; but Baradeus, in the sixth century, reunited them all into one.

The surname of Baradeus, or Zanzalus, was given to an obscure Monk, afterwards created Bishop of

Edessa, whose name was Jacob; hence his followers are also called Jacobites.

See Asseman Biblioth. Orient. Eusebii Renaud Hist. Patriarch. Alexandr.

No. 6.

(MONOPHYSITES.)

The Monophysites, who maintain that in Christ the divine and human nature were reduced into one, are generally considered a sect of the Eutychians, but Dr. Mosheim observes, that by way of not appearing to have the least inclination towards the doctrine of Eutyches, which they profess to reject with the most ardent zeal, they propose their own system with the utmost caution and circumspection, and hold the following obscure principles: that the two natures are united in Christ without either confusion or mixture, so that though the nature of our Saviour be really one, yet it is at the same time twofold and compound.

Assemani Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vatican, tom. ii. See also Theologia Æthiopica of Gregory the Abyssinian, published by Fabricius, in his Lux Evangelii toti orbi exoriens.

The Monophysites of Abyssinia and other places of Africa stood firm against every attempt of the Romish missionaries. In the beginning of the seventeenth century, Pays the jesuit laboured so effectually with Dengil, emperor of Abyssinia, who is head both of church and state, that he became inclined towards Popery; and, it is said, wrote to his holiness for missionaries to convert his subjects: provoked herewith, they rebelled, and dethroned him in 1604.

The Eastern churches, not subject to the patri-

arch of Constantinople, and which differ from the Greek church in doctrine and worship, may be comprehended under two distinct classes. Monophysites, and Nestorians or Chaldeans.

The Monophysites are subdivided into two sects or parties, the one Asiatic, including the Jacobites and Armenians, and the other African, comprehending the Copts and Abyssinians.

And in the class of Nestorians are to be included the St. Thomé Christians, or Christians of St. Thomas, on the coast of Malabar.

See Mosheim, Brown, Adam.

No. 7.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ *And this Wisdom became flesh, and dwelt among us, full of favour and truth; and we saw his brightness**, a brightness from the Father, like the brightness of an only Son.”—Wakefield's Translation.

“ * *Brightness, δοξαν*; see Silva Critica ii. on Luke xxiii. 2. What our Evangelist alludes to, is the transfiguration on the mount; which extraordinary spectacle appears also to have made as great an impression upon Peter's mind; See 2 Ep. i. 17. and hence also appears the propriety of connecting *παρὰ πατρός* with *δοξαν*.”

Wakefield.

“ *And Wisdom became man and dwelt among us, and we beheld its glory, the glory as of the well-beloved of the Father, full of grace and truth.*”—Lindsey.

“ This sense of the passage is approved by Dr. Lardner, Dr. Priestley, Mr. Wakefield, and others. It is supposed to be countenanced by Solomon's description, Prov. viii. by the custom of the Chaldean paraphrasts in using the Word of God for God

himself: See Isa. xlv. 12. xlviii. 13.; Gen. i. 27. iii. 8. Lindsey's Seq. p. 380, and by the use of the word *λογος* by Philo and other philosophers in or near the Apostolic age, to personify the wisdom and the power of God. *Λογος εστιν εικων θεου, δι' ου παντας ο κοσμος εδημιουργειτο.* Phil. Jud. p. 823, ed. Lut."

See Lindsey's Version as it appears in his list of false readings and mistranslations, p. 40.

" *And the Word was flesh, and full of kindness and truth, he dwelt among us; and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only Son*, who came from the Father.*"—Unitarian Version.

" Or nevertheless the Word was flesh, or a man; see John xvii. 2.; Mark xiii. 20.; Luke iii. 6.; Gal. ii. 16. Though this first preacher of the Gospel was honoured with such signal tokens of divine confidence and favour, though he was invested with so high an office, he was nevertheless a mortal man. Cappe. In this sense the word flesh is used in the preceding verse. '*Flesh,*' says Mr. Lindsey, Sequel to the Apology, page 136, 'is frequently put for *man*. Psalm lxv. 2.; Rom. iii. 20.' But it frequently and peculiarly stands for man as mortal; subject to infirmities and sufferings: and as such is particularly appropriated to Christ here, and in other places. 1 Tim. iii. 16.; Rom. i. 3. ix. 5.; 1 Pet. iii. 18. iv. 1. '*ο λογος σαρξ εγενετο,*' the Word *was* flesh, not *became* flesh, which is Newcome's translation, or, *was made* flesh, which is the common version. The most usual meaning of *γινομαι* is *to be*. In this sense *εγενετο* is used in this chapter, ver. 6. also in Luke xxiv. 19. 'The things concerning Jesus of Nazareth, *ος εγενετο* who *was,*' not who *became,* 'a prophet.' See Cappe, p. 86, and Socinus in Loc."

" * *As of the only Son.* This expression does not

refer to any peculiar mode of derivation of existence, but is used to express merely a higher degree of affection. It is applied to Isaac, Heb. xi. 17, though Abraham had other sons. The same word in the Hebrew is translated indifferently *μονογενής* and *ἀγαπητός*. This word is applied to Christ by the Evangelist John four times in the Gospel, and once in his Epistle; and by no other writer of the New Testament. In the Epistle to the Hebrews it unquestionably signifies beloved, or most beloved: and in this sense it is used by John, chap. i. 14. 18. iii. 16. 18.; 1 John iv. 9. ‘He seems to adopt it,’ says Mr. Lindsey, (Seq. p. 139) ‘on all occasions where the other sacred writers would have said *ἀγαπητός*.’ Comp. Matt. iii. 17. xvii. 5.; Mark i. 11. ix. 7. xii. 6.; Luke iii. 22. ix. 35. See Cappe, p. 94, and Grotius in. loc. Mr. Lindsey observes, that ‘*only begotten* is most improper language to be used in English especially with respect to Deity.’ List of wrong translations, p. 46.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.



JOHN i. 15.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“*This is he, of whom I said, He that is coming behind me, is indeed before me; for he is greater than I.**”—Wakefield.

“** Greater than I, πρῶτος μου. See Silva Critica ii. p. 35.*”

Wakefield.

“*This is he of whom I said, He who cometh after me, is before me,—for he is my principal †.*”—Unitarian Version.

“*† He is my principal. The great object of my ministry, to prepare whose way I have been sent—*

forth, Cappe, p. 13. The word *πρωτος* is used in the sense of a chief or principal, Mark vi. 21.; Luke xix. 47.; 1 Tim. i. 15, 16. comp. Matt. iii. 11.; Mark i. 8.; Luke iii. 16. ‘He that cometh after me is mightier than I.’ ”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

JOHN i. 18.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ *The only Son that is in the bosom of the Father.* ”

Unitarian Version.

Mr. Lindsey observes (Sequel, p. 139.) “ that it has been conjectured by interpreters of great note, that our apostle made choice of this word *μονογενης* to confute the strange chimerical notions which some mystic Christians fell into very early. They pretended to be acquainted with a variety of emanations or intelligences issuing from the Supreme; of these, Monogenes or only begotten, was one, and Monogenes produced Logos, the Word (Christ) and Life, which were the parents of all things produced after them.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

JOHN i. 21.

“ *Elias.* ”

(FRATRES ALBATI, OR WHITE BRETHREN.)

In the fifteenth century, a certain Priest, whose name is not known, nor indeed do historians agree

as to whence he came, gave himself out for the Prophet Elias. His followers, after the example of their chief, clothed themselves in white linen, with caps which covered their whole faces, except their eyes; they received the name of Fratres Albati, or White Brethren. Persons of all ranks followed this leader, who carried a cross, erected like a standard, and endeavoured to persuade the European nations to renew the war against the Turks in Palestine. He asserted, that he was favoured with Divine Visions, which instructed him in the will and secrets of heaven. Boniface IX. caused him to be apprehended and burnt.

See Annal. Mediol. ap. Muratori, Niem. l. ii. c. 16. L'enfant Hist. du Concile de Pise, tom. i. p. 102.

JOHN i. 30.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ Who is indeed before me, for he is greater than I.”

Wakefield's Translation.

“ After me cometh a man who is before me, for he is my principal.”

Unitarian Version.

JOHN iii. 5.

“ Born of water and of the Spirit.”

(QUAKERS.)

The Quakers regard this as a figurative expression, similar to that in St. Matt. iii. 11; “ He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire;” and one of their body quotes, by way of exemplification, the

explanation given by St. Matthew of the following words of Christ, John vii. 38, "He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water," ver. 39, "*but this spake he of the Spirit*, which they that believe on him should receive."

(See Notes on Matt. iii. 11.; xxviii. 19.)

JOHN iii. 13.

*"No man hath ascended up to heaven *, but he who came down from heaven †, even the Son of man, which is in heaven †."*

(UNITARIANISM.)

"* The Polish Socinians interpret the expression of a local ascent of Christ into heaven, whither they suppose him to have been taken at the commencement of his ministry, to receive divine instruction."

"† *He who came down from heaven.* This clause is correlative to the preceding. If the former is to be understood of a local ascent, the latter must be interpreted of a local descent. But if the former clause is to be understood figuratively, as Raphelius and Doddridge explain it, the latter ought in all reason to be interpreted figuratively likewise. If 'to ascend into heaven,' signifies to become acquainted with the truths of God, 'to descend from heaven,' is to bring down, and to discover those truths to the world. And this text clearly explains the meaning of the phrase, wherever it occurs in this evangelist. 'Coming down from heaven means coming from God,' (see ver. 2.) as Nicodemus expressed it, who did not understand this of a local descent, but of a divine commission. So Christ interprets it, ver. 17. Simpson."

"† *Which is in heaven.* This clause is wanting in

some of the best copies. If its authenticity be allowed, it is to be understood of the knowledge which Christ possessed of the Father's will. See John i. 18."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

JOHN iii. 16.

"Only begotten."

(See Note on John i. 14.)

JOHN iii. 31.

"He that cometh from above."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"If coming from above, or from heaven, meant only receiving a divine commission, then John came from above, or from heaven, as well as Jesus.'—Newcome. This remark of the learned primate is perfectly just; accordingly, the Baptist is said to have been sent from God, chap. i. 6, and his baptism to have come from heaven, Matt. xxi. 25.; Mark xi. 30.; Luke xx. 4. When therefore he speaks of Christ as coming from above, and from heaven, in contradistinction to himself, he can only mean to express the great superiority of our Lord's mission; character, and powers. So ver. 34, he describes Christ as he whom God had sent, meaning that he was such by way of eminence and distinction from all others, but not intending to discredit his own divine mission, or to insinuate that he did not him-

self deliver a message from God. See chap. i. 9. See Lindsey, Seq. p. 217, and Grotius in loc."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

JOHN iv. 23, 24.

"True Worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth. God is a Spirit," &c.

(QUAKERS.)

The peculiar mode of public worship adopted by the Quakers, is founded in great measure upon these passages :

They argue, that as God is a Spirit, and the soul of man is spiritual, words are not essentially necessary in the performance of the solemn duty of worship, because He who is a Spirit, understands the language of the Spirit.

When in the place of their religious worship, they think it right to sit down in silence, and wait therein upon God, for the assistance of that Spirit which helpeth man's infirmities, and without which, he knoweth not what to pray for as he ought. Hence it frequently happens, that their meetings are continued throughout in silence.

See Tuke's Principles of Religion, as professed by the Society of Christians, usually called Quakers.

"By the Society of Friends," says Mr. Gurney, "no ministry is admitted in connection with the worship of God, but such as is considered to arise immediately from divine influence; that their views on this subject, as well as those respecting typical

ordinances, are founded upon that part of the divine law which prescribes, that God being a Spirit, should be worshipped spiritually; that in order, moreover, to be accurately applicable to the mental condition of the hearers, the ministry must be prompted and ordered by him, who alone ‘searcheth the reins and the hearts,’ that the examples of preaching, and public prayer, recorded in the Bible, have in general the character of unpremeditated effusions, flowing immediately from the spirit of truth and righteousness; that such, more particularly, was the prophesying exercised in their assemblies for worship by the primitive Christians. Finally, that analogy, Scripture, and experience, united in bearing evidence that the immediate influences of the Spirit, as productive of such administrations, were not to be withdrawn from the church on earth, and that they continue to operate to this very hour.

“Since Friends allow of no audible administration in connection with public worship, except such as arise out of the immediate impression of the Holy Spirit, it is evident, that when those impressions are withheld or withdrawn, and at all times, except during the actual utterance of ministry, their assemblies must continue in a state of silence.

“When they meet together for the solemn purpose of worshipping their common Lord and Father, they dare not rush into his sacred presence with offerings of confessions, prayer, and praise, prepared beforehand or extemporaneously invented. They sit down, therefore, in reverent stillness before him; and whenever it happens, that no one present possesses a gift in the ministry, or that the individuals who possess such a gift are not called into the exercise of it, the silence with which the

meeting commences, continues uninterrupted until the time arrives for its separation."

Gurney's Observations on the Religious Peculiarities of the Society of Friends.

JOHN v. 30.

"I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me."

(MONOTHELITES.)

Those who maintained, that notwithstanding the two natures in Christ, viz. the human and the divine, there was, nevertheless, but *one will*, which was the *divine*, were termed Monothelites.

"Les Monothélites ne niaient point qu'il n'y eût deux natures en Jesus Christ, et en quelque sorte deux volontés; savoir, la volonté divine et la volonté humaine; mais ils enseignaient que la volonté humaine de J. Christ n'était que comme un organe, ou comme un instrument dont la volonté divine se servait, en sorte que la volonté humaine de J. Christ ne voulait, ne faisait rien d'elle-même, et n'agissait que selon que la volonté divine la mouvait et la poussait; comme quand un homme tient à sa main un marteau, et qu'il frappe avec ce marteau; on n'attribue pas proprement le coup au marteau, mais à la main qui a remué et fait agir le marteau.

"Il y a néanmoins cette difference, que l'homme et le marteau qui frappent, ne sont pas une seule et même personne. Les Monothélites disaient aussi, qu'il n'y avait qu'une seule volonté personnelle et une seule opération en J. Christ, parcequ'il n'y avait que la nature divine qui, comme maitresse, voulait et opérait, mais que la nature et la volonté humaine

n'agissait point proprement, et n'était considérée que comme purement passive, en sorte qu'elle ne voulait point d'elle-même, et qu'elle ne voulait que ce que la volonté divine lui faisait vouloir; c'est pour cela qu'ils disaient qu'il n'y avait qu'une seule énergie en Jésus Christ." (Voyez les lettres de Cyrus, de Sergius et d'Honorius, dans les actes du sixième concile général, act. xii. 13. Colloquium Pyrrhici cum Maximo, apud Baron. tom. viii. p. 681.)

See Dictionn. des Hérésies.

JOHN v. 39.

"Search the Scriptures."

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

"'Tis not a command for all to read the Scriptures; but a reproach to the Pharisees, that reading the Scriptures as they did, and thinking to find everlasting life in them, they would not receive him, to whom all those Scriptures gave testimony, and through whom alone they could have that true life."

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

JOHN vi. 7. 13.

"If I depart, I will send him unto you. He shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak."

(MACEDONIUS.)

Macedonius, Bishop of Constantinople, in the fourth century, affirmed, that the Third Person of the Trinity was merely a divine energy, diffused throughout the universe, and not a distinct person proceeding from the Father and the Son.

Macedonius quoted these passages from St. John, as representing the Holy Spirit subordinate to the Father and the Son; and added, that through them the Holy Ghost exists; by them he is instructed; by their authority and inspiration he speaks. 1 Cor. ii. 10.

He is the Consoler of Christians, said Macedonius; he prays for them, (Rom. viii. 26.) which functions, he contended, are not suitable to divinity.

Many of the Semiarians, after Macedonius, their leader, were denominated Macedonians, or Pneumatomachians.

See Sozom, lib. iv. c. 27. Socrates Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. c. 4.

JOHN vi. 38.

"I am come down from heaven."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"i. e. I am invested with a divine commission."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

(See Note on John iii. 13.)

JOHN vi. 53, 54.

"Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood."

No. 1.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

It has been mentioned in a Note on Matt. xxvi. 27, that the Roman Catholic Laity are not permitted to partake of the chalice. In justification of their practice, they put the following interpretation on this passage of St. John.

“To receive both the body and blood of Christ, is a divine precept, insinuated in this text; which the faithful fulfil, though they receive but in one kind; because in one kind they receive both body and blood, which cannot be separated from each other. Hence life eternal is here promised to the worthy receiving, though but in one kind, ver. 52. ‘If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give, is my flesh for the life of the world.’ Ver. 58. ‘He that eateth me, shall live by me.’ Ver. 59. ‘He that eateth this bread, shall live for ever’.”

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

No. 2.

On the 14th June, 1415, the assembled Fathers ~~passed~~ *passed the famous decree*, which took the *cup* from the ~~the~~ *laity* in the celebration of the eucharist; ordered, that the Lord's Supper should be received by them only in one kind, i. e. the *bread*, and rigorously prohibited *the communion in both kinds*.

See Mosheim and Priestly's Corruptions.

JOHN vi. 62.

“What if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up to where he was before.”

(UNITARIANISM.)

“This text is generally understood of a local ascent to a place from whence there had been a previous local descent. But this interpretation is not necessary, nor does it well suit the connection. To

ascend where he was before, is, as all interpreters agree, to ascend to heaven. But this phrase, as applied to the Son of Man, means nothing more than ‘searching into the truths of God;’ a sense, in which Dr. Doddridge says, that the phrase ‘ascending into heaven,’ is plainly used in many other places, and which indeed no one disputes. The proper meaning, therefore, of this passage seems to be this: Do ye revolt at what I have now said? what then would you do if I should advance still farther into the subject of my mission, and reveal truths which would be still more remote from your apprehension, and more offensive to your prejudices?”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

JOHN vi. 63.

“It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you are Spirit and are life.”

(GREEK CHURCH.)

The Greek church at the present day uses this invocation, and in opposition to the Roman, lays the great stress of the consecration upon it. Whence it may be as clearly argued, that the Greek church, according to the voice of its liturgies, even as published by Goar in his Euchologion, owns not Transubstantiation, as defined by the Romanists. It is, however, a humiliating consideration that the Greeks, in their low depression, scarcely understood their own offices, and used many terms without any precise meaning.

Adam's Religious World.

Those who wish for farther particulars on this subject, may consult an account of the present Greek

church, (1722) by Dr. Covel, who wrote with a particular view to communicate to the world the result of his inquiries into this doctrine of transubstantiation in the Greek church.

(See Note on Matt. xxvi. 26.)

JOHN vii. 38.

“He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.”

(WHITEFIELD.)

Whitefield gives the following description of his preaching in the open fields near Bristol.

“As the scene was new, and I had just begun to be an extempore preacher, it often occasioned many inward conflicts. Sometimes, when twenty thousand people were before me, I had not, in my own apprehension, a word to say either to God or them. But I never was totally deserted; and frequently, (for to deny it would be lying against God) so assisted, that I knew by happy experience what our Lord meant by saying, ‘out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.’ The open firmament above me, the prospect of the adjacent fields, with the sight of some thousands and thousands, some in coaches, some on horseback, and some in the trees, and at times all affected and drenched in tears together; to which sometimes was added the solemnity of the approaching evening, was almost too much for, and quite overcame me.”

Southey's Life of Wesley.

(See Note on John iii. 5.)

JOHN vii. 39.

“ The Holy Ghost was not yet given, because,” &c.

(QUAKERS.)

The Quakers, who believe that the Holy Spirit has in every age and state of the world been in degree afforded to mankind, understand that this Holy Spirit was now more plentifully poured forth, and became the leading feature of the Christian religion.

(See Note on Rom. ii. 14.)

JOHN viii. 14.

“ I know whence I came, and whither I go.”

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ q. d. I know from whom my authority is derived, and to whom I am accountable. See chap. iii. 13. xiii. 1. 3.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

JOHN viii. 44.

“ Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own ; for he is a liar, and the father of it.”

(MANES AND MANICHEANS.)

From these words, (and Matt. vii. 18. *“ A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit,”* &c.) Manes endeavoured to shew the necessity of acknowledging

in the world a good and evil principle, the causes of all good and evil.

“Who is the father of the devil?” inquired Manes, “he is not God; for it would be blasphemy to make him a liar—who is then?”

He concludes, that the devil must be the son or creature of some evil being, who is not God; and that there is another principle, with the power of creating, besides God.

He contended farther, that Jesus Christ had informed mankind, that the benevolent God did not reign alone in the world; that the prince of darkness exercised a tyrannical empire over man, that he bore him incessantly towards evil, excited in him a thousand dangerous passions, suggested to him a thousand crimes; those, he added, who admitted but one principle, made no distinction between light and darkness, and that no error was more unreasonable or injurious towards God. In short, that these false ideas of the Supreme Being pervert morality, and prevent men from following the precepts and counsel of the Gospel.

The Manicheans rejected the Old Testament, because it supposes the supreme God to be the origin of evil as well as good.

See Epiph. Hæres. Aug. de Moribus Manichæorum, de Hæres. op. imperfect. l. vi. c. 6.

JOHN viii. 58.

“*Before Abraham was born I am he.*”—Wakefield's Translation.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“I have rendered the words *ἐγώ εἰμι*, ‘*I am he*:’ viz. *the Messiah the Christ*: and the peculiar use of

the *present tense*, in the usage of *scriptural* expression, is to imply *determination* and *certainty*: as if he had said, ‘My mission was settled and certain before the birth of Abraham.’ See Matt. xvii. 11. And the reader may observe, that our Lord is elsewhere spoken of, even *after* his arrival, as well as *before*, under the term ὁ ἐρχόμενος, *the comer*, or *he who cometh*. He must observe also, that the translators violate their usual practice on this place by omitting *he* after *I am*: and from no other reason, than because their notion of *Christ* being the same as *Jehovah*, prevailed over their judgment on this occasion: their *critical knowledge* was no match for their *superstitious prejudices*. In ver. 24, of this very *chapter*, our Lord says to the *Jews*, ‘Unless ye believe that I AM, ye will die in your sins.’ That *I am* what? The most high God? No man will have the assurance to assert it, or to suppose, that our Saviour could expect them to believe such a doctrine. No: but they would *die in their sins*, if they did not believe him to be *the Christ*, and receive him as such: to be the *Son of God*, not *God himself*. See ix. 35, and abundance of such places.

“The same observation upon the phrase *I am*, ἐγώ εἰμι, is equally applicable to all the following: ver. 28 of this chapter; iv. 26.; Luke xxiv. 39. xxi. 8, which last assertion is expressed at full length in Matt. xxiv. 5.”

Wakefield.

“The expression ἐγώ εἰμι, is uniformly used in the sense of ‘*I am he*,’ or *I am the Christ*: it occurs twice in this discourse, ver. 24. 28. It must therefore, in all reason, be taken in the same sense here,

especially as this signification best suits the connexion."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

JOHN ix. 38.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"And the man said, I believe, teacher, and fell down before him."
Wakefield.

"And the man said, Sir, I believe; and he did Jesus obeisance."
Unitarian Version.

JOHN x. 18.

(UNITARIANISM.)

*"I have a commission to lay it down, and I have a commission * to receive it again; this charge I received from my Father."*
Wakefield's Translation.

" A commission ἐξουσίαν; or, I am authorised; though this is not so applicable to the laying down of his life, as to the receiving of it again; and the passage is of that kind, adduced in my Silva Critica, on Matt. xxvi. 29.*

"In all the variety of places where ἐξουσία is used, it uniformly means authority or privilege, or a delegated commission conferred by some superior."

Wakefield.

"None taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have authority to lay it down, and I have authority to receive it again. This commission I have received from my father."—Unitarian Version.

"To lay down life was a voluntary act, to which Jesus submitted in full confidence that it would be

speedily restored to him. The common version, which the primate here adopts, is, ‘ I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again :’ which seems to imply, that our Lord’s resurrection was the effect of his own power, a sense which the words in the original do not convey, and which is directly contrary to the most explicit declarations of the Scripture, Acts ii. 24. iii. 15. xvii. 31. ; Rom. vi. 4. ; 1 Cor. xv. 15.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

JOHN x. 20.

“ He hath a demon and is mad.”—Unitarian Version,

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ Observe, these words express cause and effect. The effect, the disease, is insanity: the supposed cause is possession by a demon, or a human ghost, than which no supposition can be more absurd. But it was the philosophy of the age.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

JOHN x. 30.

“ I and my Father are one.”

No. 1.

The Abbot, Joachim, contended that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, were one entire Being, not by existing in a common substance, but by being so united in consent and will, that they were as effectually so, as if they had been but one being; in

the same manner, as many men are said to form one people.

Sherlock adopted this argument against the Socinians, in his justification of the doctrine of the Trinity, but it has been condemned as an hypothesis favorable to the doctrine of Tritheism.

Dictionnaire des Hérésies.

(See Notes on John xiv. 9.)

No. 2.

(UNITARIANISM.)

In support of the Unitarian interpretation of this passage, Mr. Wakefield observes:

“ In John xvii. 20, 21, Christ prays that the believers may be *one* with him and the Father, as the Father is in him and he in the Father.

“ Paul says, in the same language, 1 Cor. iii. 8. ‘ that the planter and waterer are one’.”

See Wakefield's Preface to his Translation of the New Testament.

“ To snatch my true disciples out of my hand, would be to snatch them out of the Almighty Father's hand, because I and my Father are one— one in design, action, agreement, affection. See chap. xvii. 11. 21, 22.; 1 Cor. iii. 8. and, in some copies, iv: Gal. iii. 28.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

JOHN xii. 46.

“ I am come a light into the world.”

In the reign of Edward VI. an injunction was issued, that no wax candles or tapers should be

burnt before images; but it was added, only two lights upon the high altar before the sacrament shall remain still, to signify that Christ is “the light of the world.”

See Neal's History of the Puritans.

JOHN xiii. 14.

“Ye also ought to wash one another's feet.”

No. 1.

(GREEK CHURCH.)

In the Greek, as well as in the Latin church, there is a ceremony called the divine and holy **Lavipedium**, observed on Holy Thursday, i. e. the Thursday of Passion Week, in imitation of our Saviour's humility and condescension in washing his Apostles' feet. At Constantinople, Jesus Christ is, on this occasion, personified by the patriarch, and everywhere else, by the Bishop of the diocese, or the Principal of the Monastery; and the twelve Apostles by twelve Priests or Monks, when a contest arises who shall represent Judas, for the name attaches for life.

Euchologion, sive Rituale Græcorum Jac. Goar.

No. 2.

(MORAVIANS.)

It is a custom with the Moravians, after receiving the sacrament on the first Saturday in the month, to wash each other's feet: the men and women apart.

Southey's Life of Wesley.

JOHN xiv. 9, 10.

"He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."

"I am in the Father and the Father in me."

No. 1. (PATROPASSIANS.—PRAXEAS.—NOETUS.—SABELLIUS.)

Praxeas, in the second century, by way of opposing the errors of those who contended, that there exists more than one principle, or who denied the Divinity of Christ, said that Jesus Christ was not to be distinguished from the Father, since, in this case, he conceived we must either acknowledge two principles, or deny that Christ was God.

Upon the above-mentioned passages of St. John, and also x. 30, "I and my Father are one," he founded his opinion, that it was the Father himself who was incarnate, and who suffered for us. Hence his followers were termed Patropassians, and also Monarchians.

Noetus and Sabellius adopted these sentiments. Sabellius allowed no distinction between the persons of the Trinity, but that which is attributable to the different operations of one and the same thing.

When he contemplated God, forming his decrees and determining to call men to salvation, he called him Father; when the same God became incarnate, he denominated him the Son; and again, when he viewed God infusing his Spirit into the souls of sinners, he denominated him the Holy Ghost.

According to this hypothesis, he made no distinctions between the divine personages. The titles of Son and Holy Spirit, he considered as mere denominations derived from different acts of the Almighty, designed to effect the salvation of men.

As the idea of the Sabellians, with regard to the Trinity, has, by some, been called a Modal Trinity, they have likewise been called Modalists.

Some affirm, that the sects founded by Noetus and Sabellius, differed in several important articles.

Noetus is said to have asserted, that the Father had united himself with the man Christ, and was born and crucified with him, while Sabellius maintained, that the word and the Holy Spirit were only emanations from the Deity, &c.

See Tertulliani lib. contra Praxeam. c. ii. Epiph. Hæres. 57. Aug. Hæres. 41. Wormius Hist. Sabelliana.

As the doctrine of Sabellius had its rise and chiefly prevailed in Ptolemais, or Barce, one of the five cities of Pentapolis, a province of Upper Egypt, it was called *Damnabilis Pentapolitana Doctrina*.

Euseb. Hist. l. vii. c. 6.

Dr. Cudworth observes, “the doctrine of Sabellianism is no other than this, that there was but one hypostasis or single individual essence, of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and consequently, that they were indeed but three *several names, or notions, or modes*, of one and the self-same thing.”

See Cudworth's Intellectual System.

No. 2.

(MACARIUS.)

In the ninth century, Macarius, a native of Ireland, propagated that opinion which was afterwards adopted and professed by Averroes, viz. that one individual intelligence, one soul, performed the spiritual and rational functions in all the human race.

Mabillon Præf. ad Sæc. part 2.

JOHN xiv. 12, 13.

“He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do.”

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

Mr. Butler remarks, “It is known, that Roman Catholics, relying with entire confidence on the promises of Christ, believe, that the power of *working miracles was given by Christ to his Church; and that it never has been, and never will be, withdrawn from her.*

“Through the prophet Joel ii. 29, 30, God announced to the Jews, that ‘in the last days he would pour out his spirit on all flesh,’ that ‘their sons and their daughters should prophecy, that their young men should see visions, and their old men dream dreams.’

“When St. Peter cited this prophecy to the Jews, assembled at the feast of Pentecost, he declared to them, that the promise contained in it ‘was made to them, to their children, and to all that were afar off, whom the Lord God should call.’ Acts ii. 39. Christ, in his last Sermon, after exhorting St. Philip to believe in him as God, equal to his Father; and after appealing to his works as the testimony given by his Father to this truth, expressed himself in the following solemn terms: ‘Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth in me, the works that I do, these shall he do, and greater works than these he shall also do.’ When, just before his ascension into heaven, Christ took his last leave of his Apostles, and gave them his last blessing, he mentioned to them the signs which should follow those who believed. ‘In my name,’ he said, ‘they

shall cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues, they shall take up serpents; and, if they eat any thing deadly, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay their hands on the sick, and they shall be cured.' Here Roman Catholics confidently ask; Did not Christ promise by these words, that miracles should be wrought in his Church? That they should be wrought without limitation of time? That some of these should be greater than his own?"

Butler's Book of the Roman Catholic Church.

JOHN xiv. 16.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"I will ask the Father, and he will give you another advocate."

Wakefield and Unitarian Version.

JOHN xiv. 16.

"That he may abide with you for ever."

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

"Hence it is evident, that this spirit of truth was ~~not~~ only promised to the persons of the apostles, but ~~also~~ to their successors through all generations."

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

JOHN xiv. 26.

"Teach you all things."

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

"Note that the Holy Ghost is here promised to the apostles and their successors, particularly, in

order to teach them *all truth*, and to preserve them from *error*."

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

JOHN xiv. 28.

"*My Father is greater than I.*"

No. 1.

(ORIGEN.)

Origen maintained, that in the Trinity, the *Father* is greater than the *Son*, and the *Son* than the *Holy Ghost*.

Maclaine's Note.

Origen held, that the *Son* is in *God*, that which *reason* is in *man*; and that the *Holy Ghost* is nothing more than the *divine energy*, or active force.

Mosheim.

No. 2.

(ARIUS.)

Arius, a Presbyter of the Church of Alexandria, who lived in the fourth century, by way of opposing Sabellius, ran into the contrary extreme, and maintained that the Son was totally and *essentially* distinct from the Father; that he was the first and noblest of those beings, whom God the Father had created out of nothing, the instrument by whose subordinate operation the Almighty Father formed the universe, and therefore inferior to the Father, both in *nature* and in *dignity*.

Mosheim.

For that description of Arianism which is most recent, See the correspondence between Dr. Price and Dr. Priestley; Dr. Price's Sermons; Ben Mordecai's Letters, which are the grand text book of modern Arians; and Mr. Benjamin Carpenter's Lectures on the Works of Creation, and the Doctrines of Revelation, 2 vols. 8vo.

No. 3.

In the twelfth century, a great dispute happened concerning our Saviour's expression, "My Father is greater than I." New illustrations were added to the text. The Emperor, Emmanuel Comnenus, who it seems interfered with all the theological contests, maintained, that the expression related to the flesh *hid in Christ and subject to suffering*, κατὰ τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ κτιστὴν καὶ παθητὴν σάρκα. He ordered his explanation to be graven on tables of stone, in the principal churches of Constantinople, and denounced capital punishment against all such, as should oppose it, or teach any doctrine inconsistent therewith.

Nicetas Choniates. Annal. lib. vii. sect. 6. p. 113.

No. 4.

(SOCINI.)

The Socinians derived their name from the Sozzini (Lælius and * Faustus Socinus) who lived in the middle of the sixteenth century. They endeavoured to strip revealed religion of every circumstance not clearly intelligible by human reason. With respect to the grand point on which they differed from other Christians, they altogether denied the divinity of Christ, or equality with the Father, but admitted him to have been an extraordinary person miraculously produced, and commissioned as a divine teacher, in whom the prophecies relating to the Messiah were completely, though not literally fulfilled.

* A Roman Catholic Writer informs us that the following lines were inscribed on the tomb of F. Socinus :

"Tota licet Babylon destruxit tecta Lutherus,
Muros Calvinus, sed fundamenta Socius."

Those Socinians, who asserted that Christ was not begotten by an extraordinary act of divine power, but that he was born like other men in a natural way, were termed Budnæans, from Budnæus, their leader.

See Bayle's Dict. Art. Socinus. Sandii Biblioth. Anti. Trin.

No. 5.

Speaking of himself and his brethren, the Unitarians, Mr. Belsham says of the term Socinians, "We do not answer to that name, nor do we approve of being distinguished by it. In the first place, because the doctrine we hold is not borrowed from Socinus, but is known, and universally allowed to have been coeval with the apostles. And further, we differ very materially from the opinions of that very great and good man, and his immediate followers, who strangely imagined, that Christ, though a human being, was advanced by God to the government of the whole created universe, and was the proper object of religious worship. We call ourselves Unitarians; or to distinguish ourselves from other classes of Christians who assume that name, proper, or original Unitarians; and we regard ourselves as entitled to this distinction, from prescription, from the reason of the thing, and now from the custom of the language, quem penes arbitrium est, et jus, et norma loquendi."

Letters upon Arianism, p. 25.

No. 6.

(HUMANITARIANS.)

Mr. Adam, in his Religious World Displayed, remarks, "that some of the modern Socinians, be-

ing zealous advocates for the *simple humanity* of Christ, have taken the name of Humanitarians. This name is adopted by Mr. B. Hobhouse, in his reply to Mr. J. Randolph."

JOHN xvi. 7.

"If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you: but if I depart, I will send him," &c.

(MAHOMET.)

The followers of Mahomet do not fail to produce several texts from the Old and New Testament to support their master's cause.

"By the Comforter," says Dr. Prideaux, "the Mahometans will have their prophet to be here meant; and therefore among other titles which they give him in their language, one is Paraclet, which is the Greek word here used in this text for the Comforter, made Arabick. They also say, that the very name of Mahomet, both here and in other places of the Gospel, was expressly mentioned, but that the Christians out of malice have blotted it out, and corrupted those holy writings; and that at Paris there is a copy of the Gospel without these corruptions, in which the coming of Mahomet is foretold in several places, with his name expressly mentioned in them.

See Prideaux's Life of Mahomet.

Mr. Sale observes, that instead of παράκλητος "the Comforter," the Mahometans read περίκλυτος "the renowned," which word they apply to their own prophet.

See Sale's Koran, p. 98.

As Mahomet allowed both the Old and New Testament, so could he prove his mission from both. The following are some of the texts made use of for this purpose by those who defend his cause.

Deuteronomy xxxiii. 2. “The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; he shined from Mount Paran, and he came with ten thousands of saints; from his right hand went a fiery law for them.”

By which words the Mahometans understand the coming down of the law to Moses on Mount Sinai; of the Gospel to Jesus at Jerusalem; and of the Alcoran to Mahomet at Mecca. For, say they, Seir are the mountains of Jerusalem where Jesus appeared, and Pharan the mountains of Mecca where Mahomet appeared. But, adds Dr. Prideaux, they are here much out in their geography; for Pharan is a city of Arabia Petræa, near the Red Sea, towards the bottom of that gulph, not far from the confines of Egypt and Palestine, about five hundred miles distant from Mecca. It was formerly an episcopal see, under the patriarch of Jerusalem, and famous for Theodorus, once bishop of it, who was the first that in his writings published to the world the opinion of the Monothelites. It is at this day called Fara. From hence the deserts lying from this city to the borders of Palestine, are called the deserts, or wilderness of Pharan; and the mountains lying in it, the mountains of Pharan, in Holy Scripture, near which Moses first began to repeat, and more clearly explain the law to the children of Israel before his death; and to that refers the text abovementioned.

Psalms l. 2. We have it, “Out of Sion, the perfection of beauty, God hath shined,” or, “out of

Sion hath God appeared, in perfect beauty." Which the Syriac version reads thus: "Out of Sion God hath shewed a glorious crown." Some Arabic translation having expressed the two last words by *Ec-lilan Mahmudan*, i. e. an honourable crown; by *Mahmudan* they understand the name of Mahomet, and so read the verse thus, "Out of Sion hath God shewn the crown of Mahomet."

Isaiah xxi. 7. "And he saw a chariot with a couple of horsemen, a chariot of asses, and a chariot of camels." But the old Latin version hath it, "*Et vidit currum duorum equitum, ascensorem asini, et ascensorem cameli:*" i. e. "And he saw a chariot of two horsemen, a rider upon an ass, and a rider upon a camel."

Where, by the rider upon an ass, they understand Jesus Christ, because he did so ride to Jerusalem; and by the rider on the camel, Mahomet, because he was of the Arabians, who ride upon camels.

See Prideaux's Life of Mahomet, and Marracci in Alcoran, p. 26.

JOHN xvi. 27.

"I came out from God."

(UNITARIANISM.)

(See Note on John xiii. 3.)

John xvii. 3.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"And this is that eternal life, that they may know thee to be the only true God, and Jesus, thy messenger, to be the Christ."

Wakefield, Lindsey, and Unitarian Version.

"I look upon εἶναι to be understood in both the clauses of this verse. See xx. 31."

Wakefield.

“Observe here, that there is but one true God, and that Jesus Christ is expressly excluded from being that true God, and contradistinguished from him as his messenger.”

Lindsey, p. 50.

JOHN xvii. 5.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“And therefore, Father, do thou glorify me with thyself, with that glory, thine own glory*, which I had before the world was,”
Wakefield's Translation.

“* Thine own glory ; παρα σοι. I connect it with δοξῆν, though this is not material ; and we might render, that glory, which I had of thine : and I suppose the author placed it thus distant, to prevent awkwardness and ambiguity by coming too near παρα σεαυτω. I look upon it to be equivalent here to παρα σου. Polyb. p. 696, ed. Casaub. ἡττηθεντων και δεηθεντων των παρα σου πολιτων : where, if I mistake not, παρα σοι would have been equivalent—tuis civibus. I am solicitous about nothing on this occasion but to ascertain the phraseology : for what this glory is, we are not obscurely told in v. 22, whereby it appears to be of a kind not peculiar to Christ ; as God's love also for him was. xvii. 23.”

Wakefield.

“The glory which is the object of our Lord's petition, is that glory of which he speaks, ver. 22 ; the glory of instructing and converting mankind, verses 8. 14. This glory he had given to his apostles, ver. 22 ; that is, he intended it for them. The same

glory the Father had given to him: that is, had reserved it for him, and purposed to bestow it upon him. He had it therefore with the Father before the world was, that is, in the Father's purpose and decree. In the language of the Scriptures, what God determines to bring to pass is represented as actually accomplished. Thus, the dead are represented as living. Luke xx. 36, 37, 38. Believers are spoken of as already glorified. Rom. viii. 29, 30. Things that are not, are called as though they were. Rom. iv. 17. And in ver. 12, of this chapter, Judas is said to be destroyed, though he was then living, and actually bargaining with the priests and rulers to betray his master. See also ver. 10.; Eph. i. 4.; 2 Tim. i. 9.; Rev. xiii. 8.; Heb. x. 34."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

JOHN xvii. 18.

"As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"This text shews that to be sent into the world does not express or imply a pre-existent state, but a divine commission for the instruction of mankind."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

JOHN xvii. 20, 21.

See Wakefield's Note on John x. 30.

JOHN xix. 34.

“ One of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side.”

Innocent V. instituted festivals, sacred to the memory of the *lance* with which our Saviour's side was pierced, the *nails* that fastened him to the cross, and the crown of thorns he wore at his death.

Benedict XII. appointed a festival in honour of the marks of Christ's wounds.

See J. H. a Seelen: Diss. de Festo Lanceæ et clavorum Christi—Baluzii Vit. Pontif. Avenion. t. i. p. 328. Miscellan. t. i. p. 417.

JOHN xxi. 17.

“ Feed my sheep.”

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

“ Our Lord had promised the spiritual supremacy to St. Peter, St. Matt. xvi. 19, and here fulfils that promise, by charging him with the superintendency of all his sheep, without exception; and consequently of his whole flock, that is, of the whole Church.”

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

A C T S.

Acts i. 10.

(See Note on Luke ix. 30.)

Acts ii. 17.

"Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy."

(QUAKERS.)

The Quakers allege, that these prophetical words allude to the active part which women would in aftertimes take in the ministry, and would justify the practice usual in their meetings, were there no other texts to substantiate it.

See Tuke's Exposition of the Principles of the Quakers;

Acts ii. 23.

"Crucified."

(ORIGEN.)

Origen affirmed, that as Christ had been crucified in this world to save mankind, he is to be crucified in the next to save the devils.

Maclaine's Note.

ACTS ii. 42. 44.

“ And they continued stedfastly in the Apostles’ doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and of prayers.

“ And all that believed were together, and had all things common.”

(GLASS AND SANDEMAN.)

The disciples of John Glass* and Robert Sandeman, preachers in North Britain, were in the habit of constantly communicating together in the Lord’s Supper every Sabbath; for they considered the Christian Sabbath as designed for the celebration of divine ordinances, which are summarily comprised in Acts ii. 42. 44.

In the interval between the morning and afternoon service, they have their love-feasts, of which every member partakes, by dining at the houses of such of the brethren as live sufficiently near, and whose habitations are convenient for that purpose.

Their professed design in these feasts, is to cultivate mutual knowledge and friendship, to testify that they are all brethren of one family, and that the poor may have a comfortable meal at the expense of the more wealthy; and this and other op-

* Mr. Glass, about the year 1727, having offended some of his brethren by certain peculiar notions, both of justifying faith, and of the nature of Christ’s kingdom, was tabled as an offender before the presbytery of which he was a member, and afterwards prosecuted before the provincial synod of Angus and Mearns.

It is worthy of remark that this schism of Glass and Sandeman is the first which has occurred in the church of Scotland, since its establishment in consequence of the revolution in 1688.

See Mr. Glass’s Testimony of the King of Martyrs, and Sandeman’s Letters on Theron and Aspasio.

portunities they take for the kiss of charity, or the saluting of each other with the holy kiss.

Gregory's History of the Christian Church.

(See Note on 1 Cor. v. 1.)

ACTS ii. 46,

"Breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart."

(WESLEY.)

"In order," said Wesley, "to increase in them a grateful sense of God's mercies, I desired that one evening in a quarter, all the men, on a second, all the women, should meet; and on a third, both men and women together, that we might together eat bread, as the ancient Christians did, *with gladness and singleness of heart.*

"At these love-feasts*, so we termed them, retaining the name as well as the thing, which was in use from the beginning, our food is only a little plain cake and water.

"But we seldom return from them without being fed, not only with the meat which perisheth, but with that which endureth to everlasting life."

Wesley's Letter to the Rev. Mr. Perronet.

* The Agapæ, which for the first three centuries were observed in the Church, owing to some abuses which had insinuated themselves into their celebration, began to be disesteemed, and in time gradually declined.—*Gregory's History of the Christian Church.*

Acts iii. 1.

"Now Peter and John went up together into the temple at the hour of prayer, being the ninth hour."

(SMECTYMNUS).

Bishop Hall, in his controversy with Smectymnuus in the reign of Charles I. (see Note on 1 Tim. iv. 14.) respecting the antiquity of Liturgies, or Forms of Prayer, quoted this passage to shew that the prayer wherein Peter and John joined, was not of an extempore and sudden conception, but of a regular description.

The Smectymnuan divines endeavoured, however, to shew, from passages of the early writers, that there were no Liturgies in the times of the first and most venerable antiquity; that they were free to ask the same things which are desired in the Lord's Prayer, aliis atque aliis verbis, sometimes in one manner of expression, and sometimes in another. They added, that the liberty of prayer was not taken away till the times when the Arian and Pelagian Heresies invaded the Church; it was then first ordained, that none should pray pro arbitrio sed semper eadem preces; that they should always keep to one form of prayer.

For farther particulars of this controversy, see Neal, vol. ii. p. 398.

In 1645, the Parliament called in all Common Prayer Books, and imposed a fine upon those ministers who should read any other form than that contained in the Directory.

King Charles forbade the use of the New Directory, and enjoined the continuance of the Common Prayer by a Proclamation from Oxford, dated Nov. 13, 1645.

Neal's History of the Puritans.

ACTS iii. 22.

"Like unto me."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"And, therefore, a human being; otherwise he would not have been a prophet like his illustrious predecessor."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

ACTS iv. 30, 31.

"And that signs and wonders may be done by the name of thy Holy Child Jesus; and when they had prayed, the place was shaken where they were assembled together," &c.

(WESLEY.)

One day after Wesley had expounded the fourth Chap. of Acts, the persons present called upon God to confirm his word. "Immediately," he adds, "one that stood by, to our no small surprise, cried out aloud, with the utmost vehemence, even as in the agonies of death; but we continued in prayer, till a new song was put into her mouth, a thanksgiving unto our God. Soon after, two other persons (well known in this place, as labouring to live in all good conscience towards all men) were seized with strong pain, and constrained to roar for the disquietness of their heart. But it was not long before they likewise burst forth into praise to God their Saviour. The last who called upon God as out of the belly of hell, was a stranger in Bristol; and in a short space he also was overwhelmed with joy and love, knowing that God had healed his backslidings. So many living witnesses hath God given, that his hand is still stretched out to heal, and that signs and won-

ders are even now wrought by his Holy Child Jesus." At another place, "a young man was suddenly seized with a violent trembling all over, and in a few minutes, the sorrows of his heart being enlarged, sank down to the ground; but we ceased not calling upon God till he raised him up full of peace and joy in the Holy Ghost."

Southey's Life of Wesley.

ACTS v. 3.

"Satan."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"Satan; a spirit and temper opposite to that of the Gospel. To deceive the Holy Spirit, i. e. men who were inspired by God. Observe here, both Satan and the Holy Spirit are personifications of qualities. Mr. Simpson observes, that in ver. 4 and 9, 'the sin is in direct terms attributed to themselves, and that this plain language must interpret the figurative'."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

ACTS vii. 53.

"Of Angels."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"With great pomp and splendour on the Mount. Thunder, lightning, and tempest may be called angels, like the plague of Egypt, Psalm lxxviii. 49, and the burning wind, Isaiah xxxvii. 36. Or, by Moses, Aaron, Joshua, and a succession of authorized prophets and messengers of God."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

ACTS vii. 59.

"Stephen."

No. 1.

The remains of St. Stephen, after they had remained buried and unknown more than three centuries, were said to have been revealed by Gamaliel, the tutor of St. Paul, to the favoured Lucianus, a Priest, and being discovered in the place to which he had directed the search, were removed with the utmost solemnity to Jerusalem; where they became so celebrated from the miracles they were said to have performed, that many devout visitors to Jerusalem enriched their native cities, on their return, with small portions of these surprising remains.

Gregory's History of the Christian Church.

"Lord Jesus receive my spirit."

No. 2.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"This address of Stephen to Jesus, when he actually saw him, does not authorize us to offer prayers to him, now he is invisible. See Lindsey's Answer to Robinson, p. 86—89. 'Receive my spirit,' that is, receive me."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

ACTS viii. 10.

"This man is the great power of God."

(SIMON.)

Simon, who taught his doctrines about the year thirty-five asserted, that he was the great power of God, "that he descended from heaven to deliver

man, that he had assumed the human form, and that although he had apparently suffered death in Judea, he had not in reality. He taught farther, that all human actions are in themselves indifferent, and allowed his followers to indulge themselves in the greatest licentiousness. He ascribed to his mistress Helena the production of angels, and to these angels the creation of the world; and composed books for the use of his followers, which he ascribed to Christ and his Apostles.

See Lardner's Hist. Euseb. b. ii. c. 13. and Dict. des Hérésies.

ACTS x. 3.

"Angel of God."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"If this were not altogether a visionary scene, the angel who appeared to Cornelius, and who is described by him, ver. 30, as a man in bright clothing, was probably one of those who conversed with our Lord on the Mount of Transfiguration, Luke ix. 30, and who afterwards were seen by the women at the sepulchre, Luke xxiv. 4, and by the Apostles, at the Mount of Olives, after the ascension of Christ. Acts i. 10."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

(See Note on Matt. xvii. 3.)

ACTS x. 34.

"God is no respecter of persons."

(ORIGEN.)

Origen denied any other ranks of souls above human, supposing all the difference that is now be-

the highest angels and men, to have proceeded only from their merits and different uses of free-will; his reason was, that otherwise God would be an "accepter of persons." This reasoning extended by him to the soul of Christ, as not really chosen to that dignity, but for its faithfulness to the divine word in a pre-existent state. "For," saith he, the prophet thus declaring to him, "thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore hath God, even thy God, anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." The soul of Christ therefore was anointed with the oil of grace, or made one with the Word of God; for the merits of love and faithful adherence to God, no otherwise. For to be "anointed with the oil of grace," here properly signifies nothing else but to be replenished with the Holy Ghost.

Cudworth, p. 567.

ACTS x. 47.

Let no man forbid water, that these should not be baptized," &c.

(QUAKERS.)

Mr. Tuke, in his Exposition of the Principles of Quakers, observes, "It is very probable, from inquiry, that it was a matter of doubt among the Christians of that time, whether water-baptism was necessary to be continued; and that Peter, on this, as well as on some other occasions, inclined to the influence of a ceremony, at least partly Jewish."

See Tuke's Principles of Religion, &c.

Mr. Gurney observes on this subject, that Simonides, who was a man of extraordinary

sense and learning, and deeply versed in the laws and customs of the ancient Jews, has stated a variety of particulars respecting the baptism of Proselytes. It appears, that about three days after circumcision, the convert to Judaism was conducted during the day-time to a confluence of waters, whether natural or artificial, sufficiently deep to admit of entire immersion. Having been placed in the water, he was instructed in various particulars of the Jewish laws, by three scribes of learning and authority, who presided over the whole ceremony; and when these doctors had received his promises of a faithful adherence to the Jewish institutions, and had fully satisfied themselves respecting his motives and condition of mind, he completed the immersion of his whole person by dipping his head. He then ascended from the water, offered his sacrifice to the Lord, and was thenceforward considered as a complete Jew, and as a new or regenerate man; Issure Biah. cap. xiii. xiv. Wall on Infant Baptism. Selden de Synedriis, lib. i. cap. 3."

See Gurney on the Religious Peculiarities of the Society of Friends.

ACTS xiii. 39.

"By him, all that believe are justified from all things."

(ANTINOMIANS.)

"God sees no sin in believers; and they are not bound to confess sin, mourn for it, or pray that it may be forgiven. They need not fear either their own sins, or the sins of others, since neither can do them any injury."

Doctrine of the Antinomians.

ACTS xiv. 23.

“And when they had ordained them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting,” &c.

This verse, and 1 Tim. iv. 14, were quoted by Axton, to shew that the Bishop, then examining him, was not lawfully called, according to the Word of God.

Axton, minister of Morton Corbet, in Leicestershire, was cited into the Bishop's Court three several times in the year 1570, and examined upon the reasons of his refusing the *apparel*, the *cross in baptism*, and *kneeling at the sacrament*.

Neal's History of the Puritans.

ACTS xv. 1.

“Except ye be circumcised.”

(COPTS.)

The Copts still observe the custom of circumcision, probably by way of conciliating the Mahometans.

Nouveaux Mémoires des Missions de la Compagnie de Jésus dans le Levant.

ACTS xv. 20.

“From things strangled,” &c.

No. 1.

(ANABAPTISTS OR MENNONITES.)

The more rigid Anabaptists or Mennonites reckon the law of Abstinance from things strangled, and blood, still binding upon them.

See Mosheim.

No. 2. (COPTS.)

The Copts abstain from things strangled, and from blood.

Nouveaux Mémoires des Missions de la Compagnie de Jésus dans le Levant.

No. 3. (GLASS AND SANDEMAN.)

The followers of Glass and Sandeman also observe this practice.

See Adam's Religious World.

ACTS xviii. 4.

“Sabbath.”

No. 1.

In the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the Parliament passed a Bill for the better and more reverent observation of the Sabbath; it being profaned in England at that time by the acting of plays, &c. as it is in many countries at the present period.

See Neal.

The House of Commons thought fit in the time of the Commonwealth to enforce former ordinances respecting the Sabbath. It was ordained, (April 19, 1650.) “That all goods cried or put to sale on the Lord’s Day, or other days of humiliation and thanksgiving, appointed by authority, shall be seized. No waggon or drover shall travel on the Lord’s Day, on penalty of ten shillings for every offence. No person shall travel in boats, in coaches, or on horses, except to church, on penalty of ten shillings. The like penalty for being in a tavern. And where dis-

tress is not to be made, the offender is to be put into the stocks six hours. All peace-officers are required to make diligent search for discovering offenders; and in case of neglect, the Justice of Peace is fined five pounds, and every constable twenty shillings: such was the severity of the times.

Neal's History of the Puritans.

No. 2.

(SABBATARIANS.)

Those who keep holy the Jewish Sabbath, or Saturday, are denominated Sabbatarians. They are to be found chiefly, if not wholly, among the Baptists, whence they are sometimes called the *Seventh-day Baptists*; and they hold, in other respects, the distinguishing doctrines of Christianity, in common with other Christians.

See Gregory's History, &c. and Adam's Religious World.

ACTS xix. 12.

"From his body were brought unto the sick, handkerchiefs," &c.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

(See Note on Matt. ix. 21.)

ACTS xx. 7.

"Paul preached unto them, and continued his speech until midnight."

"I remember," says Burnet, "in one fast-day, there were six sermons preached without intermission. I was there myself, and not a little weary of so tedious a service." This, indeed, was in Scotland; but the service is not less tremendous in

England. Philip Henry used, on such occasions, to begin at nine o'clock, and never stir out of the pulpit till about four in the afternoon, "spending all that time in praying and expounding, and singing and preaching, to the admiration of all that heard him, who were generally more on such days than usual. John Howe's method of conducting these public fasts, which were frequent in those miserable days, was as follows: He began at nine o'clock with a prayer of a quarter of an hour, read and expounded Scripture for about three quarters of an hour, prayed an hour, preached another hour, then prayed half an hour; the people then sang for about a quarter of an hour, during which he retired, and took a little refreshment; he then went into the pulpit, prayed an hour more, preached another hour, and then, with a prayer of half an hour, concluded the service."

See Burnet.

ACTS XX. 22.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"And now behold! I feel myself forced in my mind to go unto Jerusalem."—Wakefield's Translation.

"I have given what appears to me to be the true sense of the phrase *δεδεμενος τῷ πνεύματι*: but I should have adopted the ingenious idea of Dr. Mangey, if these words in his sense had not unsuitably anticipated the following verse, 'Perhaps,' says the Doctor, 'in my mind already bound: presaging his imprisonment'."

Wakefield.

ACTS xx. 28.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“*As for yourselves, therefore, and all that flock, of which the Holy Spirit made you overseers, take care to tend the Church of God, which he gained for himself by his own Son*.*”—Wakefield’s Translation.

“I have altered my opinion of this passage, and have determined for this reading from the same considerations, that would have influenced me in the case of any indifferent and uncontroverted text. It is the reading of the Ethiopic version, whose authority is with me irresistible on this occasion; see Note xvi. 7. and most unjustifiable is this assertion of Griesbach, *Æthiops habet vocabulum quo semper utitur, sive θεος in Græcâ veritate legatur, sive κυριος: neutri igitur lectioni favet*: which is infamously false. On the contrary, as far as my recollection will carry me, this translator *never* employs the word here introduced, but to signify *the supreme God alone*. See Castell’s Lexicon in the word בָּרַךְ. This was my first inducement to retain this reading. My next was, the variation between the Syriac and Coptic versions; the former of which has the *Church of the Messiah*; and the latter, the *Church of the Lord*; and this want of uniformity excites in me a strong suspicion of interpolation in consequence of the peculiar sentiments of the translators or the authors of those MSS. which they followed.”

“* *His own Son*, τοῦ ἰδίου αἱματος, literally *his own blood*: but as this expression could answer no good purpose, and would unavoidably lead those unacquainted with the phraseology of these languages, into erroneous doctrines and impious conceptions of the Deity, I could not justify myself in employ-

ing it in this place. So blood is used for man in xvii. 26, and Matt. xxvii. 4. So Homer, Iliad, Z. 211.

Ταυτης τοι γενεης τε και Αιματος ευχομαι ειναι.
Αιμα σοφου Φοιβοιο και ευπαλαμοιο Κυρηνης.

Add Nonnus D. lib. v. p. 152.

“ And the Scholiast on Eur. Orest. 1239, says Αιμα
δε οι Παιδες, γενος οι αδελφοι, συγγενεια οι γαμβροι.

“ And Virgil, Æn. VI. 836.

Projice tela manu, Sanguis meus !

“ This is well known, and supplies the most easy and obvious interpretation of this most disputed passage. See also Mr. Henley’s Note in the Appendix to Bowyer’s Criticisms, who first excited in my mind the idea of this acceptation, and to whom therefore the entire applause, justly due to this excellent solution of so great a difficulty, ought in all reason to be given. If no passage of the New Testament quite parallel can be found, we should recollect, that Luke is an elegant writer, and does not confine himself to the narrow limits of Hebrew phraseology, as might be shewn by many instances.”

Wakefield.

“ *To feed the Church of the Lord which he hath purchased with his own blood.*”—Unitarian Version.

“ The received text reads God upon the authority of no manuscript of note or value, nor of any version but the modern copies of the Vulgate. The Æthiopic uses an ambiguous expression, but this version is avowedly corrupted from the Vulgate; and particularly in this book. See Marsh’s Michaelis, vol. ii. p. 96. The word ‘ Lord,’ is supported by all the most ancient and valuable ma-

manuscripts, whether of the Alexandrian or Western edition, by the Coptic, Syriac, and other ancient versions, and by citations from the early ecclesiastical writers. See Griesbach's note upon this text in his second edition. The expression 'blood of God,' is not quoted by the earliest ecclesiastical writers, and is rejected with horror by Athanasius, as an invention of the Arians."

Note to the Unitarian Version.



ACTS xx. 33. 35.

"I have coveted no man's silver," &c.

(QUAKERS.)

The Quakers make no provision for their ministers, except discharging the expences of persons travelling in the service of their religion.

"Not only," says Mr. Gurney, "do the Friends refuse to pay or hire their own ministers, but they also decline making any contributions to the paying or hiring of ministers of other denominations. Did they act otherwise, they might justly be deemed unfaithful to the light bestowed upon them, and they would in fact be subverting with one hand the edifice which they are professing to erect with the other.

"Occasions frequently occur, when our ministers, as they apprehend, are sent forth from their homes by their divine master. Constrained by the gentle influences of his love in their hearts, they visit the churches which are scattered abroad, and for a time devote themselves without intermission to the exercise of their magisterial functions. During the pro-

gress and continuance of such undertakings, they cannot be expected to provide for themselves; and it is, therefore, a practice generally prevailing in the society, to pay the expences of their journies, and to maintain them during the course of their labours. Like the seventy disciples, they eat and drink at the houses which they visit; and if they be found true evangelists, it is universally acknowledged by their brethren, and not only acknowledged, but felt, that ‘the labourer is worthy of his hire;’ or, as the sentiment is expressed in the Gospel of Matthew, that ‘the workman is worthy of his meat,’ chap. x. 10.”

See Gurney's Observations, &c.

ACTS xxi. 9.

“And the same man had four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy.”

No. 1.

(MONTANUS.)

Not only the male, but also the female disciples of Montanus, pretended to the gifts of prophecy and extraordinary illumination. Among the latter the most eminent were Priscilla and Maximilla.

See Euseb. Eccl. Hist. and Tertullian.

No. 2.

(QUAKERS.)

This text, among others, is quoted by the Quakers, who permit women to perform in the ministerial capacity.

(See Note on Rom. xvi. 1.)

ACTS xxii. 16.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“Arise, get thyself baptized, and wash away thy sins, taking upon thyself his name.”—Wakefield and Unitarian Version.

“All the ancient versions, except the Arabic, agree in reading το ονομα αυτου. And for a justification of the translation here, see Note 2. 21. The same meaning should have been given by the interpreters to Ep. Clem. ad Cor. sect. 58. See also Gen. xlviii. 16.; Isa. iv. 1. LXX.”

Wakefield.

ACTS xxvi. 18.

“From the Power of Satan unto God.”*

No. 1.

(WESLEY.)

“I have seen, as far as it can be seen, many persons changed in a moment from the spirit of ~~honor~~ fear, and despair, to the spirit of hope, joy, and peace; and from sinful desires, till then reigning over them, to a pure desire of doing the will of God. These are matters of fact, whereof I have been, and almost daily am, eye or ear witness. Upon the same evidence (as to the suddenness and reality of the change) I believe, or know this, touching visions and dreams: I know several persons in whom this great change from ‘the power of Satan unto God,’ was wrought either in sleep, or during a strong representation to the eye of their minds, of Christ, either on the cross, or in glory. This is the fact: let any judge of it as they please. But that

such a change was then wrought, appears, not from their shedding tears only, or sighing, or singing psalms, but from the whole tenour of their life; till then in many ways wicked, from that time holy, just, and good. I will show you him that was a lion till then, and is now a lamb; he that was a drunkard, but now exemplarily sober; the whoremonger that was, who now abhors the very lusts of the flesh. These are my living arguments for what I assert; that God now, as aforetime, gives remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Ghost, which may be called visions. If it be not so, I am found a false witness; but however, I do and will testify the things I have both seen and heard."

Wesley.

No. 2. (UNITARIANISM.)

" * *Satan*, i. e. error and sin personified, as the expressions in this verse show. Simpson's Ess. p. 139."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

ROMANS.

ROMANS i. 3, 4.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ *Concerning his Son* *, (who by natural descent was of the lineage of David, but with respect to his inspiration was miraculously distinguished as the Son of God by his resurrection from the dead) even *Jesus Christ our Lord.*”—Belsham.

“ * *Concerning his Son.* Christ is called the Son of God for two reasons: first, because this title is equivalent to that of Messiah, and was so understood by the Jews. See John i. 50. ‘Thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel.’ Compare Mark i. 1.; Luke iv. 41. xxii. 67. 70. Secondly, because he was raised from the dead, and put into possession of an immortal life. See Acts xiii. 33.; Heb. v. 5. In this view Christ is called the first-born, having been the first human being who was raised to immortality from the grave. Col. i. 15. 18.; Heb. i. 6.; Rev. i. 5. All believers, as heirs of the same inheritance, are also the sons of God. John i. 12.; Rom. viii. 14—17.; 1 John iii. 2. Hence they are co-heirs with Christ, and he is the first-born among many brethren. Rom. viii. 29. These are the only senses in which the title ‘Son of

God' is applied to Christ in the *genuine* apostolical writings."

Belsham.

ROMANS i. 25.

"Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator," &c.

(ARIANS.)

The first Arians were accused of idolatry for worshipping him whom they accounted a creature; and the more modern Arians, in order to evade this accusation, have framed a distinction between supreme and inferior worship.

Whiston, Clarke, Emlyn, Chandler, Benson, Pierce, and Grove, in short, all the most eminent Arians, whether churchmen or dissenters, have been worshippers of Christ; but we are now told, that, since the publications of Dr. Price, the Arians seem to have abandoned the worship of Jesus Christ, notwithstanding they still continue to believe that he is the Maker, Supporter, and Governor of the world, and the immediate dispenser of all things pertaining both to life and godliness.

See Mr. Belsham's Letters upon Arianism.

"Though, among other things, he (Dr. Price) differed from me with respect to the person of Christ, no man laid more stress than he did on his being a creature of God, equally with ourselves, and no more an object of worship than any other creature whatever."

Dr. Priestley's discourse on the death of Dr. Price, p. 25.

ROMANS ii. 14, 15.

“ For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law,” &c.

(QUAKERS.)

From this passage the Quakers infer, “ that such a portion of the Holy Spirit as is necessary for working out the soul’s salvation, is afforded to mankind universally.”

And farther ; “ that in every age and state of the world there has been a secret principle at work in the minds of men, which formed the basis of all true religion, and that this divine principle is the same with that which the Evangelist calls ‘ the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.’ John i. 9. That it is the Gospel which St. Paul says was preached to (or in) every creature which is under heaven. Coloss. i. 23. And that it is what he elsewhere styles ‘ the grace of God, which bringeth salvation, and has appeared unto all men.’ Titus ii. 11.”

See Tuke’s Principles of Religion, &c.

“ Now with Friends it is a leading principle in religion, a principle on which they deem it to be in a peculiar manner their duty to insist, that the operations of the Holy Spirit in the soul are not only immediate and direct, but perceptible ; and that we are all furnished with an inward guide or monitor, who makes his voice known to us, and who, if faithfully obeyed and closely followed, will infallibly conduct us into true virtue and happiness, because

he leads us into a real conformity with the will of God."

Gurney on the Religious Peculiarities of the Society of Friends.

ROMANS iii. 20.

"By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight."

(ANTINOMIANS.)

One of the doctrines of the Antinomians * is, that "the law might not be proposed to the people as a rule of manners, nor used in the church as a mean of instruction, and that the Gospel alone is to be inculcated and explained both in the churches and in the schools of learning."

Gregory's History of the Christian Church.

* The Antinomians sprang up in England during the protectorate of Oliver Cromwell, and extended their system of libertinism much farther than Agricola the disciple of Luther.

This sect of Presbyterians, who were called by their adversaries Antinomians, or enemies of the law, still subsist even in our times. The Antinomians are a more rigid kind of Calvinists, who pervert Calvin's doctrine of absolute decrees to the worst purposes, by drawing from it conclusions highly detrimental to the interests of true religion and virtue. Such at least is the judgment that the other Presbyterian communities form of this sect.

See Toland's Letters to Le Clerc, in the periodical work of the latter, entitled Bibliothèque Universelle et Historique, tom. xxii. p. 595—as also Hornbeck, Summa Controversiarum, p. 800. 812.

ROMANS iii. 24, 25, 26.

(UNITARIANISM.)

*“ Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption which is by Christ Jesus, whom God has set forth as a Mercy-seat * in his own blood †, for the declaration of his method of Justification, with respect to the remission of sins already committed, through the forbearance of God: for the declaration ‡, I say of his method of Justification at this present time, that he might be just, and the Justifier of him who believeth in Jesus.” —Belsham’s Translation.*

*“ * A Mercy-seat, ιλαστήριον. — This word uniformly signifies the Mercy-seat wherever it occurs, both in the Old Testament and the New; and is everywhere rendered by that word in the public version, and so it ought to have been translated here. See Exod. xxv. 22.; Numb. vii. 8, 9.; Lev. xvii. 2.; Heb. ix. 5.”*

“ † In his own blood. — That is, the blood of Christ himself. ‘The atonement under the law was made by blood sprinkled on the Mercy-seat. Christ, says St. Paul, is now shewn by God, to be the real propitiatory, in his own blood. See Heb. ix. 25, 26.’ Locke. Lev. xvi. 13, 14. Aaron is required, on the day of atonement, to sprinkle the blood of the sacrificed bullock and goat upon the Mercy-seat, and before the Mercy-seat. Christ being represented both as priest and victim, is here described as sprinkling and consecrating the Mercy-seat with his own blood. The received text reads, ‘by faith in his blood;’ but the words δια της πιστεως, by faith, are wanting in the Alexandrine manuscript, and are probably spurious. Dr. Taylor, though he retains the words, observes, that ‘faith in Christ’s blood is a mode of expression, which occurs no

where in Scripture but in this place:’ probably, therefore, it did not originally occur here.”

“ † *For the declaration, &c.*—Divine mercy having thus appointed Jesus to be the medium of the new dispensation, has thought fit to make it known to the world in the present age, in which it is our happiness to live, and which infinite wisdom has selected as the fittest and the best for the introduction of this new and benevolent scheme. And as faith in Jesus is the easy, the reasonable, and the sole condition of admission to the privileges of the new covenant, these blessings are equally open to all, whether Jew or Gentile. And thus hath God approved himself the kind parent and the equitable and impartial ruler of all his reasonable creatures. He is just to all, while he thus justifies all who believe without any exception.

“ This appears to me to be the true interpretation of this difficult and much-mistaken passage; and thus understood, it affords no foundation for the commonly received doctrine of the atonement, upon which many lay so improper a stress, and of which this passage is considered as one of the chief supports. But in order to extract any appearance of argument, in favour of this unscriptural doctrine, it is necessary, First, to interpret the word redemption, which often expresses deliverance without purchase, as necessarily including a ransom paid. Secondly, To annex the sense of propitiation to a word, which, in the Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament, uniformly signifies a *propitiatory* or Mercy-seat. Thirdly, To receive, as the genuine text, a reading which is wanting in some of the best copies, and which is unwarranted by any similar phraseology in the New Testament, viz. Faith in the

Blood of Christ. And finally, to interpret the expression, that 'God may be just,' as alluding to a satisfaction made to justice by the atonement of Christ, when there is no proof that such satisfaction was ever required, or such atonement ever made, and when the words admit of a sense more obvious, and much better suited to the connection and to the train of the Apostle's argument."

Belsham.

ROMANS iv. 1.

"Abraham."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"It is evident to all who are conversant with St. Paul's writings, that he delights in analogies and similitudes, some of which are carried to an extreme which may almost be considered as fanciful. Such, perhaps, is the allusion to the case of Abraham in this chapter, to that of Sarah and Hagar, Gal. iv. 21, and that of Melchisedek, Heb. vii. if that epistle was written by him; at any rate, these analogies are to be regarded as mere allusions and illustrations, and are not to be received as teaching abstruse and mysterious doctrines, not to be found in other and plainer passages of the New Testament."

Belsham.

ROMANS iv. 5.

"To him that believeth on God that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness."

(ZINZENDORF.)

The following is the doctrine of Zinzendorf: "You must be humbled before God; you must have a

broken and a contrite heart. But observe, this is not the foundation ; it is not this by which you are justified. This is not the righteousness, it is not part of the righteousness by which you are reconciled unto God. This is nothing to your justification. The remission of your sins is not owing to this cause, either in whole or in part. Nay, it may hinder justification if you build any thing upon it. To think you must be more contrite, more humble, more grieved, more sensible of the weight of sin before you can be justified, is to lay your contrition, your grief, your humiliation, for the foundation of your being justified ; at least, for a part of it. Therefore it hinders your justification, and a hindrance it is which must be removed. The right foundation is not your contrition, (though that is not your own) not your righteousness, nothing of your own, nothing that is wrought in you by the Holy Ghost ; but it is something without you ; the righteousness and the blood of Christ. For this is the word, to him that ‘believeth in God that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.’ This then do if you would lay a right foundation : Go straight to Christ with all your ungodliness ; tell him, thou, whose eyes are as a flame of fire, searching my heart, seest that I am ungodly ! I plead nothing else ; I do not say I am humble or contrite ; but I am ungodly. Let thy blood be a propitiation for me ! Here is a mystery ; here the wise men of the world are lost ; it is foolishness unto them. Sin is the only thing which divides men from God ; sin (let him that heareth understand) is the only thing which unites them to God : for it is the only thing which moves the Lamb of God to have compassion upon them, and by his blood to give them access to the Father. This is the word

of reconciliation which we preach : this is the foundation which never can be moved."

See Southey's Life of Wesley.

ROMANS v. 1.

" Justified by Faith."

No. 1.

(LUTHER.—CALVIN.)

Luther, as also Calvin, supposed justification to be the effect of faith, exclusive of good works, and that faith ought to produce good works, purely in obedience to God, and not in order to justification.

See, for an account of the Lutheran Confessions of Faith, C. Kocher's Bibliotheca Theologiæ Symbolicæ, p. 114.

No. 2.

(ANTINOMIANS.)

According to the Antinomian Doctrine, justification by faith is no more than a manifestation to us of what was done before we had a being.

The Antinomians say, that men ought not to doubt of their faith, or question whether they believe in Christ.

See Gregory's History of the Christian Church.

Antinomians are sometimes called Solifidians, a term compounded of two Latin words, solus, alone, and fides, faith, because they seem to carry the doctrine of faith without works to such lengths, as to separate practical holiness from Christian faith, and injure, if not wholly destroy, every obligation to moral obedience.

Adam's Religious World.

No. 3.

(WESLEY.)

“The points we chiefly insisted upon,” said Mr. Wesley, “were four.”

“*First*, that Orthodoxy, or right opinions is, at least, but a very slender part of religion, if it can be allowed to be any part of it at all: that neither does religion consist in *negatives*, in bare harmlessness of any kind; nor merely in externals, in doing good or using the means of grace; in works of piety, so called, or of charity. That it is nothing short of, or different from, the *mind that was in Christ*, the image of God stamped upon the heart, inward righteousness, attended with the peace of God and joy in the Holy Ghost.

“*Secondly*, that the only way under heaven to this religion, is to *repent and believe the Gospel*, or as the Apostle words it, ‘*repentance towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ*,’

“*Thirdly*, That by this faith, he that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, is *justified* freely by his grace, through the redemption which is in Jesus Christ.

“And, *lastly*, that being *justified by faith*, we taste of the heaven to which we are going. We are holy and happy. We tread down sin and fear, and sit in heavenly places with Christ Jesus.”

Wesley's account of the people called Methodists, in a Letter to the Rev. Mr. Perronet.

No. 4.

(ZINZENDORF.)

Zinzendorf's opinions were the following: 1. Justification is the forgiveness of sins. 2. The moment a man flies to Christ, he is justified; 3. and

has peace with God, but not always joy; 4. Nor perhaps may he know he is justified till long after; 5. For the assurance of it is distinct from justification itself; 6. but others may know he is justified, by his power over sin, by his seriousness, his love of the brethren, and his hunger and thirst after righteousness, which alone proves the spiritual life to be begun; 7. to be justified is the same thing as to be born of God. Here Wesley remarks, no; this is a mistake. Lastly, 8. When a man is awakened he is begotten of God, and his fear and sorrow, and sense of the wrath of God, are the pangs of the new birth. "These were not the tenets which Wesley had learnt from Peter Boehler, who seems more than any other man to have possessed, at one time, a commanding influence over the English aspirant. He taught thus, 1. When a man has living faith in Christ, then he is justified. 2. This living faith is always given in a moment; 3. and in that moment he has peace with God; 4. which he cannot have without knowing that he has it; 5. and being born of God he sinneth not; 6. and he cannot have this deliverance from sin without knowing that he has it."

Southey's Life of Wesley.

No. 5.

(MOLTHER.)

Molther, the Moravian, maintained, that there are no degrees of faith; that no man has any degree of it, before he has the full assurance, that there is no justifying faith short of this; that the way to attain it is to wait for Christ and be still, but not to use the means of grace, by frequenting church, or communicating, or fasting, or engaging much in private

prayers, or reading the Scriptures, or doing temporal good, or attempting to do spiritual good ; because, he argued, no fruit of the spirit can be given by those who have it not, and those who have not faith themselves, are utterly unable to guide others.

Southey's Life of Wesley.

ROMANS v. 6.

" Christ died for the ungodly."

(UNITARIANISM.)

" ὑπερ τῶν ἀσεβῶν.—The preposition *ὑπερ* does not necessarily imply an equivalent or vicarious punishment. See Acts v. 41. ix. 16. xv. 26. ; 2 Cor. xii. 15. As Christ suffered for us, we also are said to suffer for him, *ὑπερ αὐτοῦ*, Phil. i. 29 ; surely not as a sacrifice in his stead."

Belsham.

ROMANS v. 8.

" While we were yet sinners, Christ died for us."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"From this general and indefinite expression, some have strangely inferred, that the sufferings of Christ were properly speaking vicarious ; that he suffered in the stead of others ; that he endured all the torments which the elect would have endured to all eternity ; that he thus became the sinners' surety, and paid the dreadful debt due to divine justice. But it is plain, that the Apostle's language lays no just foundation for such a doctrine. He only says, that Christ died for us ; that is, for our benefit. The connection shews, that the Apostle's meaning is,

that Christ died to deliver us from the condemning sentence of the law, by ratifying the new covenant, which is a dispensation of mercy."

Belsham.

ROMANS v. 10.

"Reconciled to God, by the death of his Son."

(NESTORIUS.)

Nestorius denied the hypostatical union of the word with our nature; and supposed that there were *two persons* in Jesus Christ.

"I allow," said Nestorius, "that we must not separate the *word* from *Christ*; the Son of Man from the Divine Person. We have not two Christs, two Sons; a first, a second; nevertheless, the two natures which form this Son, are greatly distinguished, and do not admit of confusion.

"Scripture points out expressly what is applicable to the Son, and what to the word. When St. Paul speaks of Jesus Christ, he says, 'God sent forth his Son, made of a woman.' Gal. iv. 4. And again, 'We have been reconciled to God by the death of his Son,' he does not say, by the death of the *word*.

"It is, therefore, speaking in a manner little conformable to Scripture, to say, that Mary is the mother of God. Besides, this language is an obstacle to the conversion of the Pagans; for how can we oppose the Pagan deities, if we admit, that a God was born, suffered, and died? Or, by holding this language, can we refute the doctrine of the Arians, who contend, that the *word* is a creature?

"Nestorius farther said, that he could not allow the union of the human with the divine nature, be-

cause, by that union, supposing but one person in Christ Jesus, the Divinity would be subjected to the weaknesses and passions of humanity."

This doctrine excited much commotion towards the middle of the fifth century; it is now chiefly professed by the Chaldeans of Syria.

This controversy has been considered by some as merely a dispute about words. "It is true," observes Dr. Mosheim, "that the Chaldeans attribute to Christ two *natures*, and even two *persons*; but they correct what may seem rash in this expression, by adding, that these natures and persons are so closely and intimately united, that they have only one *aspect*. Now the word *Barsopa*, by which they express this aspect, is precisely of the same signification with the Greek word *προσωπον*, which signifies a *person*; and from hence it is evident, that they attached to the word *aspect*, the same idea that we attach to the word *person*, and that they understood by the word *person*, precisely what we understand by the term *nature*.

See Bayle's Dictionary, Dict. des Hérésies, and Mosheim.

No. 2.

(BARSUMAS.)

Barsumas, who was created Bishop of Nisibis, (A.D. 435.) and his followers, instead of teaching their disciples precisely the doctrine of Nestorius, rather polished and improved his uncouth system to their own taste, and added to it several tenets of their own. The Nestorians, who still remain in Chaldea, Persia, Assyria, and the adjacent countries, consider Barsumas as their parent and founder.

See Mosheim.

ROMANS v. 11.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"Received the atonement—Received this reconciliation."

Wakefield, Belsham, and Unitarian Version.

ROMANS v. 12,

"So death passed upon all men," &c.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"The Apostle here assumes and reasons upon the account of the fall contained in the Book of Genesis, as an historical fact; and he traces an analogy between the consequences of the fall of Adam, and those of the righteousness of Christ. And as the Apostle was instructed by Christ himself in the nature and the excellence of the Gospel dispensation, in all its comprehension and extent, we are fully authorised to admit his conclusions, even though we may doubt of the validity of his arguments, and the correctness of his premises. The Apostle does not say that he was inspired to assert the literal truth of the Mosaic history of the fall; probably, he knew no more of it than we do. Perhaps he only argued *ex concessio* upon the supposition of the fact; and certainly no reasonable person, in modern times, can regard it in any other light than as an allegory or fable; the moral of which is sufficiently apparent. But the Apostle assumes its historic truth; and, admitting the Mosaic account to be a fact, he argues, that the curses entailed by Adam's fall, and the blessings secured by the death of Christ, are equally inde-

pendent of the antecedent merit or demerit of those, who are the subjects of them ; also, that the curse and the blessing are equally universal, but that the blessings of the Gospel extend far beyond the miseries of the fall."

Belsham.

ROMANS v. 19.

"By one man's disobedience many were made sinners."

No. 1.

(GREGORY DE RIMINI.)

Some theologians have supposed, that the body of Adam became corrupted by sin ; consequently all bodies partake of this corruption. Although, therefore, the soul comes in a pure state from the hands of its Maker, yet, being united to a corrupt body, it contracts that corruption as a pure liquor is corrupted by an infected vase.

By way of explaining the mode in which sin corrupted the body of the first man, Gregory of Rimini supposed, that the Serpent, in conversing with Eve, infected her body by his contagious breath.

Eve communicated the contagion to Adam, and both communicated it to their children.

See Dictionn. des Hérésies.

No. 2.

De la Place rejected the opinion, *that the personal and actual transgression of the first man is imputed to his posterity*, and maintained, on the contrary, that God imputes to every man his natural corruption, his personal guilt, and his propensity to sin ; or, to speak

in the theological style, he affirmed, that *original sin is indirectly and not directly* imputed to mankind.

Mosheim—Aymon, Synodes des Eglises Reformées de France,
t. ii. p. 680.

No. 3.

(PELAGIUS AND CELESTIUS.)

With regard to original sin, Pelagius and Celestius contended, that the sins of our *first parents* were imputed to them alone, and not to their *posterity*; that we derive no *corruption* from their fall, but are born as pure and unspotted as Adam came out of the forming hand of his Creator.

Pelagius argued, that we receive from our fathers the *body only*, and the body is not capable of sin; it is in the *soul* that sin resides, and the soul proceeds pure and innocent from the hands of God.

See Pelag. apud Aug. de nat. et grat.

No. 4.

(ARMINIUS.)

Arminius, whose tenets, generally speaking, were the same as those of the Church of England at the present day, maintained, according to Mr. Gregory, “that depravity does not come upon mankind by virtue of Adam’s being their public head, but that mortality and natural evil only are the direct consequences of his sin to his posterity.”

This account, however, is at variance with the following article, given by Dr. Mosheim, as one of the five articles of Arminianism.

Art. 3.—“That true faith cannot proceed from

the exercise of our natural faculties and powers, nor from the force and operation of free-will ; since man, in consequence of his *natural corruption*, is incapable either of thinking or doing any good thing ; and that therefore it is necessary to his conversion and salvation, that he be regenerated and renewed by the operation of the Holy Ghost, which is the gift of God, through Jesus Christ."

Arminius, thinking the doctrine of Calvin, with regard to free-will, predestination, and grace, too severe, began to express his doubts concerning them in the year 1591, and upon further enquiry adopted sentiments more nearly resembling those of the Lutherans than of the Calvinists.

Burrowe's Encyc.

The Arminians received the denomination of *Remonstrants* from an humble petition, entitled, *their Remonstrances*, which they addressed, in the year 1610, to the States of Holland, and as the patrons of Calvinism presented an address in opposition to this, which they called their *Counter-remonstrances*, so did they, in consequence thereof, receive the name of *Counter-Remonstrants*.

Mosheim

The members of the episcopal church in Scotland, the Moravians, the General Baptists, the Wesleyan Methodists, the Quakers, &c. are Arminians.

Adam's Religious World.

No. 5.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“For, as by the disobedience of one man all were constituted sinners, so by the obedience of the other man will all be constituted righteous.”—Belsham’s Translation.

“A parallel is here drawn between the case of Adam and that of Christ: both of them are represented as public persons, whose conduct entailed important consequences upon all mankind. Adam was a transgressor, his sin was reckoned to all his posterity, so far that all became subject to the punishment of death for his one transgression. Christ was a pattern of obedience; he devoted himself to death, and his obedience is so far reckoned to all mankind, that, through the free goodness of God, all who became transgressors by Adam’s fall, are justified and made righteous by Christ’s one act of obedience; the sentence of death is reversed, and all are restored to life, in circumstances far superior to those from which Adam fell. But, it is observable, that Christ, while performing this office, is expressly called a man, and not a single hint is anywhere given, that, in order to accomplish the work assigned him, it was at all necessary that he should be any thing more than a man; indeed, had he been a being of superior order, the parallel would not have held. And though the blessings introduced by Christ are represented as far superior to those which were lost by Adam, yet this is not ascribed to the superior dignity of Christ, but to the free mercy of God. And it is farther observable, that the blessings imparted by Christ are represented as extending to all, without exception, who are sufferers by Adam’s fall.”

Belsham.

ROMANS vi. 3.

“ Baptized into Christ,” &c.

(QUAKERS.)

(See Notes on Matt. xxviii. 19. and Matt. iii. 11.)

ROMANS vi. 10.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ For when he died unto sin, he died once for all, but now he liveth, he liveth unto God.”—Belsham’s Translation.

“ Observe here that Christ is said to die to sin, and the Roman converts are exhorted to consider themselves as also dead unto sin. It is plain, therefore, that the Apostle does not mean to say, that either Christ, or they, died as an expiation for the sins of others. The Apostle plainly means, that each of the parties was dead to their former state, which state he calls sin; and by sin, as applied to converted heathen, he evidently intends their original state of idolatry and vice. As applied to Christ, it perhaps expresses that state of frailty and suffering to which our Lord was exposed during his personal ministry; sin and suffering being regarded by the Jews almost as convertible terms; or, it may express a state in which he was persecuted by sinners, by Jews and Gentiles, by rulers, priests, and people, by whom he was charged with sin, and treated as an offender.”

Belsham.

ROMANS viii. 2. 14.

“ For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death.

“ For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.

(BRETHREN AND SISTERS OF THE FREE SPIRIT.)

From these words of St. Paul there arose a sect, the members of which denominated themselves Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit.

These brethren, who gloried in the freedom which they pretended to have obtained through the Spirit, from the dominion and obligation of the law, adopted a certain rigid and fantastic system of mystic theology, built upon pretended philosophical principles, which carried a striking resemblance of the impious doctrines of the Pantheists.

For they held, “ that all things flowed by emanation from God, and were finally to return to their divine source ; that rational souls were so many portions of the supreme Deity, and that the universe, considered as one great whole, was God : that every man, by the power of contemplation, and by calling off his mind from sensible and terrestrial objects, might be united to the Deity in an ineffable manner, and become one with the Source and Parent of all things ; and that they, who by long and assiduous meditation had plunged themselves, as it were, into the abyss of the Divinity, acquired thereby a most glorious and sublime liberty, and were not only delivered from the violence of sinful lusts, but even from the common instincts of nature.” From these and such like doctrines the brethren under

consideration drew this impious and horrid conclusion, “ That the person who had ascended to God in this manner, and was absorbed by contemplation in the abyss of Deity, became thus a part of the Godhead, commenced God, was the Son of God, in the same sense and manner that Christ was, and was thereby raised to a glorious independence, and freed from the obligation of all laws human and divine.” It was in consequence of all this, that they treated with contempt the ordinances of the Gospel, and every external act of religious worship, looking upon prayer, fasting, baptism, and the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, as the first elements of piety, adapted to the state and capacity of children, and as of no sort of use to the perfect man, whom long meditation had raised above all external things, and carried into the bosom and essence of the Deity.

It may not be improper to place here a certain number of sentences translated faithfully from several of the more secret books of these heretics. The following will be sufficient to give the curious reader the full idea of their impiety.

“ Every pious and good man is the only begotten Son of God, whom God engendered from all eternity :” (for these heretics maintained, that what the Scriptures taught concerning the distinction of three persons in the divine nature, is by no means to be understood literally, and therefore explained it according to the principles of their mystical and fantastic system.)

“ All created things are non-entities, or nothing : I do not say that they are small or minute, but that they are absolutely nothing.

“ There is in the soul of man something that is

neither created, nor susceptible of creation, and that is, rationality, or the power of reasoning.

“ God is neither good, nor better, nor best : who-soever, therefore, calls the Deity good, does as foolishly as he who calls an object black which he knows to be white.

“ God still engenders his only begotten Son, and begets still the same Son, whom he had begotten from eternity. For every operation of the Deity is uniform and one ; and therefore he engenders his Son without any division.

“ What the Scriptures say concerning Christ is true of every good, of every divine man : and every quality of the divine nature belongs equally to every person whose piety is genuine and sincere.”

To these horrid passages we may add the following sentences, in which John, bishop of Strasbourg (in an edict he published against the Brethren of the Free Spirit, or Beghards, in the year 1317, the Sunday before the feast of the assumption of the Virgin Mary,) discovers farther the blasphemous doctrine of this impious sect. “ Deus,” say these heretics, “ est formaliter omne quod est. Quilibet homo perfectus est Christus per naturam. Homo perfectus est liber in totum, nec tenetur ad servandum præcepta ecclesiæ data a Deo. Multa sunt poetica in evangelio, quæ non sunt vera, et hominis credere magis debent conceptibus ex anima sua Deo juncta profectis, quam evangelio,” &c.

Sæ Mosheim.

ROMANS viii. 16.

“ The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God.”

(WESLEY.)

The definition which Wesley gives of the “ witness of the Spirit,” is as follows.

“ The testimony of the Spirit is an inward impression on the soul, whereby the Spirit of God directly witnesses to my spirit that I am a child of God ; that Jesus Christ hath loved me, and given himself for me ; that all my sins are blotted out, and I, even I, am reconciled to God.”

Wesley's Sermons.

ROMANS viii. 26.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ This Spirit also assists our infirmities.”—Belsham's Translation.

“ The Spirit which the Apostle here intends, is that which he had just described, the spirit of hope, of patience, and of resignation, which are the leading virtues of the Christian character.

“ By a figure, not unusual with the Apostle, he personifies these virtues, and represents them as interceding with God in secret groans for those who are at a loss to know what to ask for themselves. Thus the Spirit is said to assist their infirmities.

“ It would be extremely difficult to make sense of the passage, if ‘ by the Spirit’ we should under-

stand, as most interpreters do, a divine influence, or that of any inferior agent upon the mind, to direct believers in their prayers."

Belsham.

ROMANS viii. 29.

"He also did predestinate."

No. 1.

(LUTHER.)

Luther * opposed the doctrine of free-will, and maintained predestination.

See for an account of the Lutheran Confessions of Faith, C. Kocher's Bibliotheca Theologiæ Symbolicæ, p. 114.

No. 2.

(CALVIN.)

Calvin † maintained, "that all whom God has predestinated to life, he is pleased in his appointed time effectually to call by his word and Spirit out of that state of sin and death, in which they are by

* Martin Luther, a native of Eisleben, in Saxony, was born in the year 1483. His history is too well known to require any remarks here. The following are his own words; "Pestis eram vivus, moriens ego, mors tua, papa."

† Calvin was born in 1509. He was the son of a cooper of Noyon in Picardy; his real name was Chauvin, which he chose to latinize into Calvinus.

The theological system of Calvin was adopted, and made the public rule of faith in England, under the reign of Edward VI., and the church of Scotland was modelled by John Knox, the disciple of Calvin, agreeably to the doctrine, rites, and form of ecclesiastical government established at Geneva. In England it has partially declined since the time of Queen Elizabeth.

nature, to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ;" and that "God, in predestinating from all eternity one part of mankind to everlasting happiness, and another to endless misery, was led to make this distinction by no other motive than his own *good pleasure and free-will.*"

For the particular accounts of Calvin's transactions, see Spon. Hist. de Geneve, edit. of 1730.



ROMANS viii. 30.

"Whom he did predestinate, them he also called, and whom he called, them he also justified."

No. 1. (ANTINOMIANS.)

The Antinomians affirm, that the justification of sinners is an eminent and eternal act of God, not only preceding all acts of sin, but the existence of the sinner himself*.



No. 2. (UNITARIANISM.)

"They who in the eternal councils of the Almighty are foreknown as those who will accept the offers, and comply with the terms of the Gospel, are by the eternal decree of God ordained to eternal life: it is determined, that they shall enter into the joy of their Lord, and shall be with him where he is. And so certain is it, that the purpose and the promise of God shall be fulfilled, that though ages of

* This is the opinion of most who are styled Antinomians, though some suppose with Dr. Crisp, that the Elect were justified at the time of Christ's death.

ages may possibly intervene, it may nevertheless be spoken of as already accomplished in the view of that all comprehending Being, to whom things which are not, are as though they were; and in whose sight a thousand years are as one day.

“ Observe here, that the Apostle speaks very familiarly of an event, which exists only in the eternal, immutable purpose of God, as having actually taken place, even though it had not then, nor has yet come to pass. They who were foreknown and predestinated, and invited and justified, are also said to be glorified; that is, in the divine decree, which at the appointed time will assuredly be fulfilled; which to the all-comprehending mind of God appear as though they actually existed, in reference to which, things that are not, are spoken of as though they were.

“ Let it not then be said, that those Christians pervert the plain language of Scripture, who understand the Lord's assertion of his existence before the time of Abraham, and of the glory which he had with the Father before the world was, as an existence and a glory which he possessed only in the divine decree; for if it is quite necessary, in the case before us, to interpret the glorification of true believers, as an event hitherto only existing in the divine mind, it is equally reasonable to explain the existence and glory attributed to Christ, as existing only in the divine decree ”

Belsham.

ROMANS viii. 33.

“ *God's Elect.*”

No. 1.

(CALVIN.)

The doctrine of Calvin, with regard to election, is, that “ God has chosen a certain number in Christ to everlasting glory, before the foundation of the world, according to his immutable purpose, and of his free grace and love; without the least foresight of faith, good works, or any conditions performed by the creature; and that the rest of mankind he was pleased to pass by, and ordain them to dishonour and wrath for their sins, to the praise of his vindictive justice.” And farther, that “ Jesus Christ, by his death and sufferings, made an atonement only for the sins of the elect.”

See Calvin's Institutions; Assembly's Confession of Faith; Bossuet's Hist. des Variations.

The disputes in Holland between the Calvinists and Arminians, upon the five points relating to election, redemption, original sin, effectual grace and perseverance, rose to such an height, as obliged the States General to have recourse to a National Synod, which was appointed to meet at Dort, Nov. 13, 1618.

Neal.

As the new explications of Armenius grew into repute, the Calvinists were reckoned old-fashioned divines, and at length branded with the character of “ Doctrinal Puritans.”

Neal's Hist. of the Puritans.

No. 2.

(ANTINOMIANS.)

“God is not angry with the elect, nor does he punish them for their sins.”

Doctrine of the Antinomians.

No. 3.

(WHITEFIELD.)

Wesley reproached Whitefield with holding the Calvinistic tenets of election and irreversible decrees.

Whitefield answered, “The doctrine of election, and the final perseverance of those who are in Christ, I am ten thousand times more convinced of, if possible, than when I saw you last.”

Southey's Life of Wesley.

ROMANS viii. 34.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“Shall any condemn them? Christ hath died for us, or rather hath been raised again: he is also at the right hand of God; he manageth our concerns for us.”—Wakefield's Translation.

“Who is he that condemneth? is it Christ? he who died? Yea, rather, who hath even been raised again? who is even at the right hand of God? who is even interposing for us.”—Belsham's Translation.

“The word *intercede* is applied to Christ only twice in the New Testament: and it is so obvious that it properly signifies nothing more than to act for the advantage of another, that it is surprising to think how a doctrine so mysterious and unscriptural

as the popular doctrine of Christ's intercession, could be erected upon so slender a foundation."

Belham.

ROMANS ix. 1.

"I say the truth in Christ."

(QUAKERS.)

Mr. Gurney remarks, that "it is observed by Pye Smith in his valuable work, entitled 'The Scripture Testimony to the Messiah,' that Paul, in his epistles, has sworn 'by Christ.' Such is the interpretation given by this writer to the expression *ἐν Χριστῷ* in Rom. ix. 1, a passage which he renders 'I speak the truth; by Christ! I lie not;' See vol. ii. part ii. chap. iv. p. 637. That *ἐν* followed by a dative is sometimes used in the formula of an oath, appears from Matt. v. 34.; Rev. x. 6, &c. But surely it is altogether unnecessary to attribute to the Apostle so light and irreverent an use of the name of our Saviour. The expressions *ἐν Χριστῷ* are of very frequent occurrence in Paul's epistles, and in scarcely any instance are they capable, on any fair critical ground, of being thus interpreted. It appears to me, that the true explanation of Rom. ix. 1, is to be found in the Apostle's well known doctrine, that whatever the Christian says or does, he is to say or do in the name of Christ, in the character of a disciple of Jesus, comp. 2 Cor. ii. 17. xii. 19."

See Gurney on the Religious Peculiarities of the Society of Friends.

ROMANS ix. 5.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ Whose were the fathers, and of whom was Christ according to the flesh ; who is as God over all, blessed for evermore. Amen.”

Wakefield's Translation.

“ On this controverted text I shall find an opportunity, it is possible, hereafter, of again delivering my sentiments ; and shall, on such occasions, be governed by the voice of MSS, and versions, though no wit of man can furnish a satisfactory answer to the objections that have been, and may be advanced against it. I adopt, with the Æthiopic translator, a lower sense of Θεός, which is common in the Old Testament, and so our Apostle, in 2 Thess. ii. 4, and elsewhere.”

Wakefield.

*“ Whose are the fathers ? Of whom is Christ according to the flesh ? Whose is the God * over all, blessed for evermore ?”*

Belsham's Translation.

“ * Whose is the God, ὃν ὁ for ὁ ὃν.—This, most probably, is the true reading, agreeably to the judicious conjecture of Slechtingius, Whitby and Taylor, though it is not authorized by any manuscript, version, or Ecclesiastical authority : but the connection seems to require it. It is next to impossible, that the Apostle, when enumerating the distinguishing privileges of his countrymen, should omit the greatest privilege of all ; namely, that God was in a peculiar sense their God, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. This he has before mentioned, as the boast of the Jews, ii. 17 ; and as the chief glory of believers in Christ, who succeed to the privileges of God's ancient people, Rom. v. 11. ; and he could not

avoid repeating it here. And the verbal misplacing of $\acute{o} \acute{\omega}\nu$ for $\acute{\omega}\nu \acute{o}$ is so very inconsiderable, that it might easily escape the pen of some early transcriber: perhaps of the Apostle's own amanuensis. A similar construction, suggested by a learned friend, occurs in Callimachus:

συ δ' ἐξελεο πολιαρχους
 Αυτους, ὧν ὑπο χειρα γεωμορος, ὧν ἰδρις αιχμης,
 Ὡν ερετης, ὧν παντα. Ὑμν. εις Δια, 73.

“ If the common reading should be preferred, the proper translation would be that of Erasmus, Dr. Clarke, Mr. Locke, Mr. Lindsey, and many others, viz. *who is over all, God be blessed for evermore; or God who is over all, be blessed for evermore.* Mr. Lindsey says, (Sequel, p. 204.) that this clause ‘ was read so as not to appear to belong to Christ, at least for the first three centuries. Origen calls it rashness to suppose, that Christ is ‘ God over all.’ See also Clarke on the Trinity, No. 539, and Taylor in loc.”

Belsham.

ROMANS ix. 20.

“ *Him that formed it.*”

(SEVERUS.)

Severus affirmed, that the human body, from the head to the navel, was the workmanship of the good, and the remaining part of the body, that of the evil principle.

Diction. des Hérésies.

ROMANS ix. 21.

"Hath not the potter power over the clay?"

(WHITEFIELD.)

"I have now," said Whitefield, "such large incomes from above, and such precious communications from our dear Lord Jesus, that my body can scarcely sustain them. I have a garden near at hand, where I go particularly to meet and talk with my God at the cool of every day. I often sit in silence, offering my soul as so much clay, to be stamped just as my heavenly potter pleases; and whilst I am musing, I am often filled, as it were, with the fullness of God. I am frequently at Calvary, and frequently on Mount Tabor; but always assured of my Lord's everlasting love.

"Our dear Lord sweetly fills me with his presence. My heaven is begun indeed. I feast on the fatted calf. The Lord strengthens me mightily in the inner man."

Southey's Life of Wesley.

ROMANS x. 12.

"Is rich unto all that call upon him."

(BOGOMILES.)

In the twelfth century there arose a sect, which received the name of Bogomiles, from their constantly suing for Divine mercy; the word *bogomilus*, in the Mysian language, signifying "calling for mercy from above." Basilus, the founder of this

sect, adopted the opinions of the Gnostics and Manichæans, with regard to Christ's body, &c.

See J. C. Wolf's Historia Bogomilorum.

ROMANS x. 15.

"How shall they preach unless they be sent."

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

"Note this against all new teachers, who have all usurped to themselves the ministry without any lawful mission, derived by succession from the Apostle to whom Christ said, St. John xx, 21, 'As my Father hath sent me, so send I you'."

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

ROMANS xii. 2.

"Be not conformed to this world."

(QUAKERS.)

Hence the refusal of the Quakers to conform to the changes of fashion in dress, furniture, &c. as also their custom of absenting themselves from places of public amusement, and even abstaining from pleasures which are generally considered harmless, as Music, &c.

See Tuke.

The following extract is from one of the printed epistles of the yearly meeting of Friends:

"We clearly rank the practice of hunting and shooting for diversion, with vain sports; and we believe the awakened mind may see that even the

leisure of those whom providence hath permitted to have a competence of worldly goods, is but ill filled up with these amusements. Therefore being not only accountable for our substance, but also for our time, let our leisure be employed in serving our neighbours, and not in distressing the creatures of God for our amusement."

Book of Extracts, Conduct, and Conversation, p. 25.

Mr. Gurney denies its being a matter of religious principle among Friends, to insist upon a certain form of dress.

"The laws by which the discipline of Friends is regulated, and the moral and religious principles by which the society is distinguished, will be found recorded under various heads, in a volume intitled the '*Book of Extracts*,' a book consisting of selections made by the authority of the yearly meeting of Friends, from the public acts and advices of that body."

ROMANS xiv. 5, 6.

(QUAKERS.)

(See Note on Gal. iv. 9.)

ROMANS xiv. 10.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"*Since we shall all present ourselves before the tribunal of God.*"
Belsham's Translation.

Dr. Priestley remarks, that "the judgment seat of Christ, and that of God, are the same; not because Christ is God, but because he acts in the name, and

we ought not to neglect the dictates of a sound and enlightened discretion : but we believe that we must not limit the Holy One of Israel, or oppose to the counsels of infinite wisdom our own fallible and unauthorised determinations. We dare not to say to the modest and pious females, ‘Thou shalt not declare the word of the Lord,’ when from an infinitely higher authority there is issued a directly opposite injunction, ‘Thou shalt go to all that I shall send thee, and whatsoever I command thee thou shalt speak.’

“ Among the early ministers of the Gospel dispensation, particular mention is made of the four daughters of Philip, who prophesied or preached; Acts xxi. 9. comp. xv. 32.; 1 Cor. xiv. 3. The same office probably devolved, in a very eminent manner, on Priscilla, the wife of Aquila, to whom all the churches of the Gentiles gave thanks, and whom Paul expressly denominates his ‘helper,’ or, as in the Greek, his ‘fellow labourer in Christ;’ Rom. xvi. 3, 4. comp. Greek text of ver. 21.; 2 Cor. viii. 23.; Phil. ii. 25; 1 Thess. iii. 2. Again on another occasion, the Apostle speaks of the women who ‘laboured’ with him ‘in the Gospel;’ Phil. iv. 3.”

Gurney on the Religious Peculiarities of the Society of Friends.

No. 2.

(MONTANUS.)

The followers of Montanus admitted women to the priesthood and also to episcopacy.

Epiph. Hær. 49.

No. 3.

(WESLEY.)

Wesley observes, in his account of the people called Methodists, alluding to the great number who volunteered to attend to the sick, “ I chose six and forty of them, whom I judged to be of the most tender, loving spirit; divided the town into twenty three parts, and desired two of them to visit the sick in each division.

“ Upon reflection, I saw how exactly in this also, we had copied after the primitive church. What were the ancient Deacons? what was *Phæbe the Deaconess* but such a visitor of the sick?”

Wesley's Letter to the Rev. Mr. Perronet.

ROMANS xvi. 12.

“ Persis, which laboured much in the Lord.”

(QUAKERS.)

Mr. Tuke observes, that ‘ the adjective for beloved being in Greek in the feminine gender, it is apparent that Persis was a woman; also that the Greek word here rendered ‘ laboured,’ is the same as the Apostle uses, when he speaks of himself labouring in the Gospel.”

(See Note on first verse of this chapter.)

ROMANS xvi. 16.

“ Salute one another with an holy kiss.”

(GLASS AND SANDEMAN.)

(See Note on Acts ii. 42. 44.)

we ought not to neglect the dictates of a sound and enlightened discretion : but we believe that we must not limit the Holy One of Israel, or oppose to the counsels of infinite wisdom our own fallible and unauthorised determinations. We dare not to say to the modest and pious females, ‘Thou shalt not declare the word of the Lord,’ when from an infinitely higher authority there is issued a directly opposite injunction, ‘Thou shalt go to all that I shall send thee, and whatsoever I command thee thou shalt speak.’

“ Among the early ministers of the Gospel dispensation, particular mention is made of the four daughters of Philip, who prophesied or preached; Acts xxi. 9. comp. xv. 32.; 1 Cor. xiv. 3. The same office probably devolved, in a very eminent manner, on Priscilla, the wife of Aquila, to whom all the churches of the Gentiles gave thanks, and whom Paul expressly denominates his ‘helper,’ or, as in the Greek, his ‘fellow labourer in Christ;’ Rom. xvi. 3, 4. comp. Greek text of ver. 21.; 2 Cor. viii. 23.; Phil. ii. 25; 1 Thess. iii. 2. Again on another occasion, the Apostle speaks of the women who ‘laboured’ with him ‘in the Gospel;’ Phil. iv. 3.”

Gurney on the Religious Peculiarities of the Society of Friends.

No. 2.

(MONTANUS.)

The followers of Montanus admitted women to the priesthood and also to episcopacy.

Epiph. Hær. 49.

No. 3.

(WESLEY.)

Wesley observes, in his account of the people called Methodists, alluding to the great number who volunteered to attend to the sick, “ I chose six and forty of them, whom I judged to be of the most tender, loving spirit; divided the town into twenty three parts, and desired two of them to visit the sick in each division.

“ Upon reflection, I saw how exactly in this also, we had copied after the primitive church. What were the ancient Deacons? what was *Phæbe the Deaconess* but such a visitor of the sick?”

Wesley's Letter to the Rev. Mr. Perronet.

ROMANS xvi. 12.

“ Persis, which laboured much in the Lord.”

(QUAKERS.)

Mr. Tuke observes, that ‘ the adjective for beloved being in Greek in the feminine gender, it is apparent that Persis was a woman; also that the Greek word here rendered ‘ laboured,’ is the same as the Apostle uses, when he speaks of himself labouring in the Gospel.”

(See Note on first verse of this chapter.)

ROMANS xvi. 16.

“ Salute one another with an holy kiss.”

(GLASS AND SANDERMAN.)

(See Note on Acts ii. 42. 44.)

FIRST CORINTHIANS.

I CORINTHIANS i. 2.

(UNITARIANISM.)

*“ To the Church of God, which is at Corinth, to those who are sanctified by Christ Jesus, who are called, who are holy, together with all in every place, who take upon themselves the name * of our Lord Jesus Christ, both their Lord and ours.”—Belsham’s Translation.*

*“ * Who take upon themselves, &c. Wakefield, Locke, Hammond, Lindsey’s Second Address, p. 273.*

“ Who take upon themselves the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, who profess to be the disciples of Christ, and who call themselves by his name. This appears to be the true sense of the Apostle’s language; and not, as our translators and others render it, ‘ who call upon the name of Christ Jesus our Lord :’ a phraseology which would encourage religious addresses to Christ: a practice absolutely inconsistent with the spirit and tenor of the Gospel, which requires that all religious worship should be directed to the Father only, who is the only invisible Being that we are sure is with us at all

times, and who is both able and willing to afford his suppliant creatures all needful protection and assistance."

Belsham.

1 CORINTHIANS i. 17.

"For Christ sent me not to baptize," &c.

(QUAKERS.)

This passage is quoted by the Quakers in justification of their disuse of Baptism.

(See Note on Matt. xxviii. 19. and Matt. iii. 11.)

1 CORINTHIANS i. 23.

"We preach Christ crucified."

Not many years passed before William Cudworth and James Rely separated from Mr. Whitefield. These were properly Antinomians, absolutely avowed enemies to the law of God, which they never preached, or professed to preach; but termed all legalists who did. With them, preaching the law was an abomination. They had nothing to do with the law. They would preach Christ, as they called it; but without one word either of holiness or good works. Yet these were still denominated Methodists, although differing from Mr. Whitefield, both in judgment and practice, abundantly more than Mr. W. did from Mr. Wesley.

See Encyc. Britan. Art. Methodists.

1 CORINTHIANS i. 30.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"But of him are ye both righteousness and holiness, and deliverance in Christ Jesus; who is become to us wisdom from God."

Wakefield's Translation.

"The true construction of this verse had escaped all the old translators, and was first pointed out by L. Boss."

Wakefield.

"But of him are ye both justified and sanctified and redeemed in Christ Jesus; who from God hath been made wisdom to us."

Belsham's Translation.

"The Apostle does not say that Christ is made by God to us, wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption; a phraseology, from which some have deduced mysterious and inexplicable doctrines; but that ye, in Christ, that is believing in the Christian doctrine, (which doctrine is the true philosophy which we have been taught by God), are thereby justified, sanctified, and redeemed. This is all from God, ἐξ αὐτοῦ, who sent and qualified the messengers of the joyful tidings."

Belsham.

1 CORINTHIANS ii. 1. 4.

"Came not with excellency of speech or wisdom—not with enticing words of man's wisdom."

(QUAKERS.)

The Quakers, who quote these words of St. Paul, in justification of their practice, exclude no person—however illiterate, from taking a part in the ministry—

1 CORINTHIANS ii. 11.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ For who knoweth the thoughts of a man, except the spirit of a man which is within him? So likewise, no one knoweth the thoughts of God but the Spirit of God.”—Belsham’s Translation.

“ The spirit of a man is a man himself, who alone is conscious of what passes within him. It is plain, therefore, that by the Spirit of God the Apostle means God himself, who alone knows the depth of his own counsels, all his own thoughts and purposes of wisdom and mercy to mankind, and reveals them to whomsoever he thinks fit. There is no reason, therefore, to suppose, that the Spirit of God is an intelligent agent, distinct from the Father, whether equal or subordinate, who is acquainted with the Father’s counsels; and the use of personal terms will by no means prove it; for nothing is more common in all ages and countries than to apply personal epithets to inanimate or imaginary beings, q. d. The Spirit which has revealed this doctrine to us, is the Spirit of God himself; who must be as intimately acquainted with all the gracious and unfathomable purposes of his own wisdom and mercy, as the mind of man is acquainted with its own thoughts.”

Belsham.

1 CORINTHIANS ii. 13.

“ Not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth,” &c.

No. 1.

(THEOSOPHISTS.)

In the sixteenth century, there arose a new sect of Philosophers, who assumed the denomination of

Theosophists. Placing little confidence in the decisions of human reason, or the efforts of speculation, they attributed all to Divine illumination and repeated experience.

See for ample account of the lives, transactions, and systems of these philosophers, Brucker's Historia Critica Philosophiæ.

No. 2.

(QUAKERS.)

This is one of the texts quoted by the Quakers, who conceive that at their meetings they can only speak acceptably to the Deity when moved by the Holy Spirit.

(See Note on Gal. i. 1.; 2 Peter i. 21.)

1 CORINTHIANS iii. 3.

“ Divisions.”

The first sixteen centuries of the Christian Church are thus distinguished by Dr. Cave.

- | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Apostolicum. | 9. Photianum. |
| 2. Gnosticum. | 10. Obscurum. |
| 3. Novatianum. | 11. Hildebrandinum. |
| 4. Arianum. | 12. Waldense. |
| 5. Nestorianum. | 13. Scholasticum. |
| 6. Eutichianum. | 14. Wicklevianum. |
| 7. Monotheliticum. | 15. Synodale. |
| 8. Eiconoclasticum. | 16. Reformatum. |

1 CORINTHIANS iii. 8.

See Wakefield's Note on John x. 30.

1 CORINTHIANS iii. 19.

"The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God."

(ABECEDARIANS.)

When the principle was established by the Reformers that every individual was a judge of the sense of Scripture, Stork, a disciple of Luther, maintained not only that every true believer might discern the sense of Scripture, that God himself instructs us, but that science prevents us from attending to the voice of God; and the best method therefore of preventing these distractions is being unable to read, and that consequently those who were able to read were in a dangerous state.

Hence a branch of Anabaptists assumed, that to be in a state of salvation it was necessary even to be ignorant of the alphabet; whence they were called Abecedarians.

Carlostad attached himself to this sect, renounced the university, and title of doctor, and took upon himself the office of a street porter. He assumed the name of brother André. This sect spread to some extent in Germany.

Consult Osiander, cent. xvi. b. 2. Stockman's Lexicon in voce Abecedarii, Bossuet, Hist. des Variat. l. 2.

1 CORINTHIANS iii. 23.

"And Christ is God's."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"As you are his subjects and servants, and acknowledge Jesus as your head, so does he, your

Master, acknowledge subjection to God, and profess allegiance to the Great Supreme, from whom he derives existence, from whom he received his high commission, and all the gifts and powers by which it was confirmed; by whose almighty power he was raised from the dead, and invested with the authority which he now exercises over the church; whose servant and subject he avows himself to be, to whose glory all his labours are consecrated, and from whose hand he has received his glorious and transcendent reward."

Belsham.

1 CORINTHIANS iv. 9.

"Angels."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"To angels; i. e. to men in high stations. See 1 Pet. iii. 22.; Ps. xcvi. 7. 'to men,' i. e. to persons of low rank. See John xix. 5.; Phil. ii. 7.; Luke xii. 36."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

1 CORINTHIANS vi. 2.

"The saints shall judge the world."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"Saints are here said to judge the world; and in other passages of the Scriptures it is said to be the office of Christ to judge the world, and the judgment of the saints is usually understood in a figurative sense; but that of Christ literally. The Scriptures,

however, do not make this distinction. It may not unjustly be alleged, that both phrases are literal, or both figurative. And hence it may be concluded, that no argument can be drawn from the office of Christ, as Judge of the world, whatever that phrase may mean, to prove that he possesses a nature superior to that of a human being; because the same office is attributed to the saints; and, for any thing that appears, in the same sense. And it is possible that nothing more may be meant by the assertion, that Christ shall judge the world, than that Christ was authorized to declare, in the most solemn and explicit manner, the unchangeable purpose of God to deal with his reasonable creatures in correspondence with their moral characters."

Belsham.

1 CORINTHIANS vi. 9.

"Adulterers."

No. 1.

During the Commonwealth in England, it was ordered (May 10, 1650,) that incest and adultery should be made felony, and that fornication should be punished with three months' imprisonment for the first offence, and that the second offence should be felony, without benefit of clergy. Persons keeping houses of ill fame, to be placed in the pillory, to be whipped, and marked on the forehead with the letter B, and then committed to the house of correction for three years for the first offence, and for the second to suffer death, provided the prosecution be within twelve months.

Neal's History of the Puritans. 11 B. 5. c. 23. § 1.

No. 2.

(GLASS AND SANDEMAN.)

A rule of discipline observed by the Glassites and Sandemanians, which they conceive to be prescribed by St. Paul (1 Cor. v. 1.) is, that where any one who is called a brother, turns out to be, by *character*, a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a drunkard, or an extortioner, the offence occasioned by his practice is not to be the subject of *private* dealing between two or three brethren, but must be directly laid before the whole church; who, if the character be established, must put him away by *excommunication*, whatever may be his profession of repentance at the time. But the offending brother is to be restored to communion with the church, and love confirmed towards him, whenever it shall appear, to the satisfaction of the church, that he repents, and is in danger of being swallowed up with over-much sorrow, according to the apostolic precept, 2 Cor. ii. 6—8.

It is rather by this strictness of discipline, than by any other peculiar tenet or usage, that this sect are to be distinguished from other dissenters; for various classes of the latter profess to hold both the faith and other tenets professed by them. But this, by which the Glassites or Sandemanians are most readily distinguished from other sects, not only prevents their becoming numerous, but keeps their numbers in a state of constant fluctuation.

Adam's Religious World.

1 CORINTHIANS vi. 14.

“ And God hath both raised,” &c.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ Observe how explicitly the resurrection of Christ is attributed by the Apostle to the power of God, and not to any power inherent in Christ himself.”

Belsham.

1 CORINTHIANS vi. 20.

“ Bought with a price.”

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ All Christians may be said to belong to God, because he has purchased them with the life of his Son. But this can only be said in a figurative, and by no means in a literal sense ; for then there must have been some person of whom he bought them, and who could this be ? It was at first imagined, that God redeemed us from the devil, by abandoning to him the life of his Son : and strange as this idea now appears, it prevailed for many centuries, and it was not till long afterwards that any person imagined that it was Christ, and not God, that was the purchaser ; having given his life to the justice of God in order to redeem us from death. This total change in the system of atonement was not completed till after the Reformation ; when Luther, in order to combat with more advantage the popish doctrine of human merit, advanced the merits of

Christ in opposition to it. Then, and not before, it was conceived that God could not forgive sin till an adequate satisfaction had been made to his offended justice: and as sin was considered to be an infinite evil, as committed against an infinite Being, it was necessary that the person, who made satisfaction, should himself be infinite, or God. But you find nothing like this in the Scriptures; there God is uniformly represented as forgiving sin freely on the repentance and reformation of the sinner, and therefore we are required to forgive, as we hope to be forgiven. And so far are we from being bought from God, by the death of Christ, that whenever this figure of speech is used, God, and not Christ is said to be the purchaser."

Priestley.

1 CORINTHIANS vii. 1.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

(See Note on Matt. xix. 21.)

1 CORINTHIANS vii. 38.

"He that giveth her not in marriage, doeth better."

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

(See Note on Matt. xix. 21.)

1 CORINTHIANS viii. 4.

"None other God but one."

(SWEDENBORGIANS.)

One of the discriminating doctrines of the Swedenborgians, seems to be the following:

“ Holding the doctrine of one God, they maintain, that this one God is no other than Jesus Christ, and that he always existed in a human form; that for the sake of redeeming the world, he took upon himself a proper human or material body; but not a human soul.

“ Though Baron Swedenborg’s* followers appear not to have been numerous during his life—they have increased since his death; and a sect subsists at present in England, which derives its origin from him, and is called, ‘ The New Jerusalem Church.’”

See Burrowes’ Encyc.

1 CORINTHIANS viii. 6.

“ *One God, the Father.*”

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ There cannot be more decisive evidence of anything than that which this passage affords, that in the opinion of the Apostle Paul, no being was to be considered as God, but the Father only; and that Christ was by no means entitled to that appellation. If Christ had been justly entitled to the appellation of God, and had been a proper object of worship, he could never have said, that there is but one God, the Father; especially as, immediately after, he mentions Christ not as God, but only as Lord, or Master. This would necessarily have led his reader into a mistake, if Christ had really been God.”

Priestley.

* Emanuel Swedenborg was born at Stockholm, 1689.

1 CORINTHIANS ix. 5.

"A woman—a sister."—Roman Catholic Version.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

"Protestants have corrupted this text by rendering it, 'a sister,' 'a wife;' whereas 'tis certain, St. Paul had no wife, (chap. vii. 7, 8.) and that he only speaks of such devout women as, according to the custom of the Jewish nation, waited upon the preachers of the Gospel, and supported them with necessaries."

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

1 CORINTHIANS ix. 27.

"But I chastise my body."—Roman Catholic Version.

No. 1.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

The Roman Catholics affirm, that penance and self-infliction, to which they ascribe so much efficacy, are in concordance with St. Paul's practice and doctrine, as is apparent from this passage.

The Roman Catholic version has the following note on this verse.

"What will our new sectaries say to this, with all their presumptuous security? Let them open their eyes now at least and see their faith, which excludes all fear, is not the faith of St. Paul."

No. 2.

(PENANCE.)

To what length the performance of Penance has been carried, will appear from the following remarks of Dr. Southey.

“They bound chains round the body, which eat into the flesh ; or fastened graters upon the breast and back ; or girded themselves with bandages of bristles, intermixed with points of wire. Cases of horrid self-mutilation were sometimes discovered, and many perished by a painful and lingering suicide ; believing that, in the torments which they inflicted upon themselves, they were offering an acceptable sacrifice to their Creator. Some became famous for the number of their daily genuflections ; others, for immersing themselves to the neck in cold water during winter, while they reached the Psalter. The English Saint, Simon Stock, obtained his name and his saintship for passing many years in a hollow tree. St. Dominic, the Cuirassier, was distinguished for his iron dress, and for flogging himself with a scourge in each hand, day and night ; and the blessed Arnulph of Villars, in Brabant, immortalized himself by inventing, for his own use, an under-waistcoat of hedgehog-skins, of which it appears five were required for the back, six for the front and sides.”

Southey's Book of the Church.

The *Penitential* was a book, in which the degree and kind of penance that were annexed to each crime, were registered.

Maclaine.

No. 3. (PILLAR SAINTS.—STYLITE.—SANCTICOLUMNARES.)

About the year 427, Simeon, a Syrian, introduced a refinement in mortification, by residing successively upon five pillars of six, twelve, twenty-two, thirty-six, and lastly of forty cubits high.

In this wretched state he continued during thirty-

seven years of his life ; and his sublime piety was, at his decease, eagerly emulated by one Daniel, a Monk, who resided upon the top of a pillar, and died in that situation at the advanced age of eighty.

The pillar saints continued to preserve their celebrity in the east till the twelfth century ; but this practice, like all other extremes of monkish fanaticism, was never so general in the west. Fleury remarks, that this order continued but three hundred and fifty years from its first institution.

Those who imitated the example of Simeon, were called Stylitæ, by the Greeks, and Sancticolunnares by the Latins. Dr. Jortin has given them the name of holy birds.

See Jortin and Fleury.

No. 4. (FLAGELLANTES OR WHIPPERS.)

Under the idea of following the example and injunction of St. Paul, with regard to self-castigation, a sect sprang up in Italy, in the year 1260, under the title of Flagellantes or Whippers, and was propagated through almost all the countries of Europe.

The societies which embraced this new discipline, presented the most hideous and shocking spectacle that can well be conceived ; they ran in multitudes, composed of persons of both sexes, and of all ranks and ages, through the public places of the most populous cities, as well as through the fields and deserts, with whips in their hands, lashing their naked bodies with the most astonishing severity, and filling the air with their shrieks, and beholding the firmament with an air of distraction, ferocity, and horror.

This sect carried their enthusiasm to the highest pitch in the fourteenth century.

They not only supposed that God might be prevailed upon to shew mercy to those who underwent voluntary punishments, but propagated other tenets highly injurious to religion. They held, among other things, that “Flagellation was of equal virtue with baptism and the other sacraments: that the forgiveness of all sins was to be obtained by it from God, without the merits of Jesus Christ; that the old law of Christ was soon to be abolished, and that a new law, enjoining the baptism of blood, to be administered by whipping, was to be substituted in its place, with other tenets more or less enormous than these.”

See C. Scotgenii Historia Flagellantium, Boileau. Hist. des Flagellans, c. 9. and Critique des Flagellans par J. B. Thiers.

1 CORINTHIANS x. 2.

“Moses.”

No. 1.

(MOSES CRETENSIS.)

In the time of Theodosius, the younger, an impostor arose called Moses Cretensis. He pretended to be a second Moses, sent to deliver the Jews who dwelt in Crete; and promised to divide the sea, and give them a safe passage through it. They assembled together, with their wives and children, and followed him to a promontory. He there commanded them to cast themselves into the sea. Many of them obeyed and perished in the waters; and many were taken up and saved by fishermen. Upon this, the

deluded Jews would have torn the imposter to pieces, but he escaped them and was seen no more.

See Jortin's Remarks, &c. vol. iii. p. 331.

No. 2.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"Were all baptised into Moses."—Belsham.

"As the phrase 'being baptised into Moses,' does not imply that Moses was a God, so being baptized into Christ, or in the name of Christ, does not imply that he is a God. It is a mode of taking upon us the profession of that religion of which he is the founder."

Priestley.

1 CORINTHIANS x. 21.

"The Lord's table."

No. 1.

In the year 1550, it was directed in England, that altars should be taken down; and the church-wardens of every parish were required to provide a table, decently covered, and place it in such part of the choir or chancel, as should be most meet; so that the ministers and communicants should be separated from the rest of the people.

The reasons for this alteration were these:

1. Because our Saviour instituted the sacrament at a table, and not at an altar.

2. Because Christ is not to be sacrificed over again, but his body and blood to be spiritually eaten and drunk at the holy supper, for which a table is more proper than an altar.

3. Because the Apostle calls it the Lord's table, 1 Cor. x. 21.

4. The canons of the Council of Nice, as well as the Fathers St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine, call it the Lord's table; and though they sometimes call it an altar, it is to be understood figuratively.

5. An altar has relation to a sacrifice; so that if we retain the one, we must admit the other; which would give great countenance to mass-priests.

6. There are many passages in ancient writers that shew, that communion tables were of wood, and that they were made like other tables: and that those who fled into churches for sanctuary, did hide themselves under them.

7. The most learned foreign divines have de-claimed against altars, as Bucer, Æcolampadius, Zuinglius, Bullinger, Calvin, P. Martyr, Joannes Alasco, Hedio, Capito, &c. and have removed them out of their several churches. Only the Lutheran Churches retain them.

Neal's Hist. of the Puritans.

(See Note on Heb. xiii. 10.)

No. 2.

It may here be remarked, with regard to the present times, that "the Protestant Dissenters, Presbyterians in Scotland, and the Baptists, receive the Lord's Supper, sitting at a common table, and handing the elements one to another."

Adam's Religious World.

1 CORINTHIANS x. 23. 32.

"All things edify not."

"Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the Church of God."

(PURITANS.)

These passages (and Rom. xiv. 21, "is made weak,") were quoted by the Puritans*, who contended, that no rites or ecclesiastical orders should be instituted or used, but such as are needful and profitable for edification; and especially, that none should be ordained or used which cause offence, and hinder edification.

The three ceremonies, alluding to the surplice, the cross in baptism, and kneeling at the sacrament, they maintained, were neither needful nor profitable, nor do they tend to edification; they have all been abused by the Roman Catholics to idolatry.

1. "The surplice has been thus abused, for it is one of those vestments without which nothing can be consecrated. All priests that are present at mass must wear it, and therefore the use of it in the church has been condemned, not only by foreign divines, but by Bishop Hooper, Farrar, Jewel, Pilkington, Rogers, and others among ourselves.

2. "The cross has been also abused to super-

* Those persons, who in the year 1564, refused to subscribe to the liturgy, ceremonies, and discipline of the church, alleging, that they required a *purser* form of worship and discipline, were styled *Puritans*, a name of reproach derived from the Cathari, or Puritani of the third century.

It may be farther remarked here, that there was no difference in point of *doctrine* between the Puritans or Non-conformists, and the Conformists.—See *Neal's History of the Puritans*.

stition and idolatry; to drive away devils, to expel diseases, to break the force of witchcraft, &c. It is one of the images to which the Papists give religious adoration. The water in baptism has no spiritual virtue in it without the cross, nor is any one rightly baptised (according to the Papists) without it.

3. "Kneeling at the sacraments has been no less abused; it arose from the notion of the transubstantiation of the elements, and is still used by the Papists in the worship of their breaden God; who admit they should be guilty of idolatry in kneeling before the elements, if they did not believe them to be the real body and blood of Christ. This ceremony was not introduced into the church, till Antichrist was at his full height; and there is no one action in the whole service that looks so much like idolatry as this."

Their next argument for the unlawfulness of the ceremonies, is taken from their mystical signification, which gives them the nature of a sacrament. Now, no sacrament ought to be of man's devising; the ceremonies therefore being affirmed in the Book of Common Prayer to be significant, are unlawful.

Their fourth argument is taken from the unlawfulness of imposing them as parts of God's worship, which they prove from hence, "That God is the only appointer of his own worship, and condemns all human inventions, so far forth as they are made parts of it. Now all the ceremonies in question are thus imposed; for divine service is supposed not to be rightly performed without the surplice, nor baptism rightly administered without the cross, nor the Lord's Supper but to such as kneel; and therefore they are unlawful."

I CORINTHIANS xi. 10.

"Power on her head because of the angels."

No. 1. (ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

"A power; that is, a veil of covering, as a sign that she is under the power of her husband; and this, as the Apostle adds, because of the angels, who are present in the assemblies of the faithful."

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

No. 2. (UNITARIANISM.)

"Because of the messengers."—Unitarian Version.

"i. e. who were occasionally sent from the separate assemblies of the men to those of the women. See Taylor in loc."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

I CORINTHIANS xi. 27.

"Eat this bread, or drink the chalice."—Roman Catholic Version.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

"Or drink.—Here the Protestant Testament is corrupted, by putting and drink, (contrary to the original, ἡ πίψν) instead of or drink."

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

1 CORINTHIANS xi. 28.

"And drink of that cup."

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

"This is not said by way of command, but by way of allowance; viz. where, and when, it is agreeable to the practice and discipline of the church."

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

(See Note on John vi. 53, 54.)

1 CORINTHIANS xi. 29.

"He that eateth and drinketh unworthily."

No. 1.

One of the injunctions given by Queen Elizabeth, (A. D. 1559,) was as follows :

"Art. XXI. Curates may not admit to the holy communion persons that live openly in sin without repentance, or that are at variance with their neighbours, till they are reconciled."

No. 2.

(GREEK CHURCH.)

Previously to receiving the communion, the mystery of confession is always necessary to the members of the Greek church; the church, indeed, prescribes it to all her members four times a year, and it is so often performed in monasteries, and as much oftener by those who have made great advances in holiness; but the laity, for the most part, confess

only once in the year, to which, in Russia, they are obliged by the law of the land; and it is usual to do it in the great fast before Easter. It is said, that they do not consider confession as a divine precept, but allow it to be only a positive injunction of the church; but if such be really the case, it does not readily appear, how it agrees with the definition of a sacrament.

But if we may credit a learned and judicious traveller, Tournefort, the practice of confession is now much abused among the Greeks.

Adam's Religious World.

According to Ricaut, confession is one of the fundamental pillars of the Eastern churches; the axis upon which their whole ecclesiastical polity turns.

See Sir P. Ricaut's State of the Greek Church.

1 CORINTHIANS xi. 29.

“Not discerning the Lord's body.”

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

“This demonstrates the real presence of the body and blood of Christ, even to the unworthy communicant; who otherwise could not be guilty of the *body and blood* of Christ, or justly condemned for not *discerning the Lord's body*.”

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

1 CORINTHIANS xii. 5.

"There are different administrations, but the same Lord."

No. 1.

(ECLECTICS.)

Towards the close of the second century, the Eclectics professed to search after truth alone, and were disposed to adopt, from every system and sect, such tenets as they thought most conformable to it. Hence they were called Eclectics. This new species of Platonism was embraced by such of the Alexandrian Christians as were desirous to retain, with the profession of the Gospel, the title, the dignity, and the habit of philosophers.

It is also said to have had the particular approbation of Athenagoras, Pantænus, Clemens the Alexandrian, and all those who in that century were charged with the care of the public school, which the Christians had at Alexandria.

See Origen Epist. ad Eusebium, tom. i. opp. p. 2, edit. de la rue.

No. 2.

(INDEPENDENTS.)

To a considerable number even the Presbyterian form of government did not appear sufficiently democratical. They discovered that the church at Corinth had an entire judicature within itself, and upon this ground they determined that every particular congregation of Christians had a complete power of regulating all its own concerns, independent of bishops, synods, or presbyteries; and agreeably to these principles, they assumed the name of Independents*. They differed from the Presbyte-

* John Robinson, a Norfolk divine, was the father of the Independents. He removed to Leyden, and erected a congregation upon the model of the Brownists; his words are these:

rians only with regard to discipline, and are said by Mr. Neal to have fought Cromwell's battles from a real belief that it was the cause of God. This sect dates its origin from the year 1616.

No. 3.

(LATITUDINARIANS.)

Those persons who wished to reconcile the Episcopalians, on the one hand, and the Presbyterians and Independents, on the other, by exhorting them to take more enlarged views on religious subjects, were styled *Latitudinarians*.

See Burnet's History of his own Times, vol. i. book ii. p. 188.

No. 4.

The Root and Branch Petition for taking away the whole hierarchy, was presented to the house, Dec. 11, 1640, by alderman Pennington, and others, in the name of his majesty's subjects in and about the city of London and adjacent counties. It was thought to be the contrivance of the Scots commissioners, who were become very popular at this time. The petition sheweth, "That whereas the government of archbishops and lord bishops, deans and

"We profess before God and man, that we agree so entirely with the reformed Dutch churches in matters of religion, that we are willing to subscribe all and every one of their articles, as they are set down in the Harmony of Confessions. We acknowledge these reformed churches for true and genuine; we hold communion with them as far as we can; those among us that understand the Dutch language, frequent their sermons, and we administer the Lord's Supper to such of their members as are known to us, and desire it occasionally."—*Neal's History of the Puritans.*

archdeacons, &c. with their courts and ministrations in them, have proved prejudicial and very dangerous to the church and commonwealth; they themselves having formerly held, that they have their jurisdiction or power of human authority, till of late they have claimed their calling immediately from Christ, which is against the laws of the kingdom, and derogatory to his majesty's states royal. And whereas the said government is found, by woeful experience, to be a main cause and occasion of many foul evils, pressures, and grievances, of a very high nature, to his majesty's subjects, in the consciences, liberties, and estates, as in a schedule of particulars, hereunto annexed, may in part appear.

“ We therefore most humbly pray and beseech this honourable assembly, the premises considered; that the said government, with all its dependencies, roots and branches, may be abolished, and all laws in their behalf made void, and that the government, according to God's word, may be rightly placed among us, and we, your honourable supplicants, as in duty bound, shall ever pray,” &c.

The schedule annexed to the petition contained twenty-eight grievances and pressures, the chief of which were, the bishops suspending and depriving ministers for non-conformity to certain rites and ceremonies; their discountenancing preaching; their claim of *jure divino*; their administering the oath *ex-officio*; the exorbitant power of the high commission with their innovations.

Neal.

1 CORINTHIANS xii. 10.

"To another discerning of spirits."

No. 1.

(SWEDENBORGIAN.)

The Swedenborgians suppose, that every man is in continual association with angels and spirits; and that without such association he could not possibly think, or exert any living faculty. It is insisted farther, that man, according to his life in the world, takes up his eternal abode, either with angels of light, or with the spirits of darkness: with the former, if he is wise to live according to the precepts of God's holy word; or with the latter, if, through folly and transgression, he rejects the counsel and guidance of the Most High.

"The Lord was graciously pleased to manifest himself to me, his unworthy servant, in a personal appearance in the year 1743, to open in me a sight of the spiritual world, and to enable me to converse with spirits and angels; and this privilege has continued with me to this day."

Swedenborg.

No. 2.

(SHAKERS.)

The Shakers, as well as the Swedenborgians, believe that they have a correspondence with angels, the spirits of the saints, and their departed friends. This they attempt to prove from 1 Cor. xii. 8. 10.

See Rathbone, Taylor, and West's Account of the Shakers, and Janson's Stranger in America.

No. 3.

(CHARLES WESLEY.)

Charles Wesley has thus expressed himself upon the ministry of angels.

“By these perfections, strength, and wisdom, they are well able to preserve us either from the approach (if that be more profitable for us), or in the attack of any evil.

“By their wisdom they discern whatever either obstructs or promotes our real advantage: by their strength they effectually repel the one, and secure a free course to the other. By the first, they choose means conducive to these ends; by the second, they put them in execution.

“One particular method of preserving good men, which we may reasonably suppose these wise beings sometimes choose and by their strength put in execution, is the altering some material cause that would have a pernicious effect; the purifying (for instance) tainted air, which would otherwise produce a contagious distemper,” &c. &c.

No. 4.

(BEHMEN.)

Jacob Behmen's books made some proselytes in England during the great rebellion.

Dr. Pordage and his family were of this sect; who lived together in community, and pretended to hold visible and sensible communion with angels, whom they sometimes saw and sometimes smelt.

Calamy's Life of Baxter.

1 CORINTHIANS xii. 11.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“But that one and the same Spirit worketh in you all these operations according to his pleasure, distributing to every man his proper gifts.”

Belsham's Translation.

“The Apostle, in this passage, applies personal terms and characters to the Holy Spirit. So like-

wise did our Lord, when discoursing upon those miraculous gifts and powers, which his Apostles should receive. But we are not to infer from this language of personification, that the Holy Spirit is an intelligent agent, distinct from God himself. It is the power of God personified. And when the Apostle saith, that the Holy Spirit distributes his gifts as he will, he no more intends to assert the personality of the Holy Spirit than of the wind, when he says, ‘The wind bloweth where it willeth,’ John iii. 8; or, the personal existence of charity, when he says, ‘Charity hopeth all things,’ 1 Cor. xiii. 7.”

Belsham.

1 CORINTHIANS xii. 13.

“Baptized into one body.”

(QUAKERS.)

(See Notes on Matt. iii. 11. and Matt. xxviii. 19.)

1 CORINTHIANS xiii. 1.

“Tongues of Angels.”

From this and the like passages, some of the fathers, so far from supposing angels altogether incorporeal, ran into the other extreme, and concluded them to be altogether corporeal, i. e. to be all body and nothing else.

On the other hand, several of the fathers plainly asserted, that both devils and angels consisted of soul and body—incorporeal and corporeal substance—

joined together. St. Austin, Claudianus, Mamertus, Fulgentius, Joannes Thessalonicensis, and Psellus, who philosophiseth much concerning this.

Cudworth, p. 812.

(See Note on Matt. xxv. 41.)

I CORINTHIANS xiii. 9, 10.

"We know in part, and prophesy in part, when that which is perfect is come," &c.

No. 1.

(MANES.)

Manes, who was born in Persia, A.D. 240, and was the founder of the sect of Manichæans, which, in six centuries afterwards, threatened even to overturn the empire of Constantinople, concluded from these words of St. Paul, that the Christians were still in expectation of the Comforter; and he flattered himself, that by assuming the title, he might gain credit to his doctrine. Accordingly he announced, that he was the Apostle of Jesus, the comforter promised by him.

The eloquence and gravity of Manes, together with the simplicity of his manners, imposed upon multitudes: but at last, Varanes I. King of Persia, put him to death.

Manes pretended, that in subjection to the Most High God, there are two eternal principles of light and darkness, from which all things proceed. God, happy and benevolent, is the Ruler of light; and Matter and Demon, unhappy and malignant, the ruler of darkness. After some ages, Demon perceiving that there was light in the universe, deter-

mined to render himself master thereof; and in a war raised for that purpose, defeated the armies of God, which were headed by the first man, seized upon a portion of light, and mingled it with the mass of corrupt matter. Not long after, himself received a terrible defeat from the armies of God, commanded by the living Spirit; but as the light was not wholly disentangled from matter, Demon formed Adam and Eve, and implanted two souls into each of them; the one sensitive, proceeding from matter, and the other rational, proceeding from that light which he had immersed into the mass of malignant matter. In pity to the souls formed from that light, God created this earth for the residence of mankind, that he might, by degrees, deliver them from the imprisonment of matter. For this purpose he employed two dignified beings, produced from his own essence, viz. Christ, the same with the Persian Mithras, a most splendid substance which resides in the sun, and is endued with wisdom and life: the Holy Ghost, a luminous and animated body, diffused through the whole atmosphere which surrounds our earth, and which warms and fructifies the same, and enlightens the human mind. After God had long instructed men by angels and prophets, he sent Christ to this world to hasten the return of the imprisoned souls of men to himself. Having assumed the appearance of a human body, he taught men how to conquer the violence of corrupt matter, and disengage themselves from it. Instigated by Demon, the Jews attempted, and, in appearance, crucified Christ; but he had really returned to his place in the sun, and ordered his chosen disciples to propagate his doctrines on earth. To them he promised the Holy Ghost a few days

after his ascension, and afterwards another comforter, to unveil his doctrines and perfect his laws. Such souls, as renouncing the demon or god of the Jews, believe in Christ the Son of God, and obey his laws, especially as explained and perfected by Manes, the promised comforter, and with vigour combat their natural appetites and lusts, shall be gradually purged from the contagion of matter; and after death, being in their ascent to God, purified fifteen days with water in the firmament, and afterwards fifteen more with fire in the sun, shall enter into the mansions of endless blessedness. Such souls as disobey the laws of Christ, shall, at death, pass into other bodies; and some of the more wicked shall be tried by the tortures of malignant spirits. When the most part of human souls are recovered to liberty and happiness, a devouring fire shall issue from its present place of confinement, and burn up the frame of this world. After which, the princes and powers of darkness, forced back to their native abodes of misery and anguish, shall be for ever shut up therein, by a numerous and powerful guard of damned souls of men.

See Dict. des Hérésies, and Brown's Gen. Hist. &c.

The chief and most eminent assertors of the Ditheistic doctrine of two self-existent animalish principles in the universe, a good God and an evil dæmon, were the Marcionites and Manichæans, both of which, though they made some slight pretences to Christianity, yet were not by Christians owned for such.

Cudworth, p. 213. l. i. c. 4.

No. 2.

(MONTANUS.)

Montanus, born in the second century at Ardabon, in Mæsia, appears to have acted in a similar manner to Manes.

Montanus affected to believe himself the Paraclete, or Comforter, and announced that he was sent to perfect the moral doctrines of Christ.

He made a distinction between the Comforter promised by Christ to his Apostles, and the Holy Spirit which was shed upon them on the day of Pentecost; and understood the former as a Divine Teacher, which character he himself assumed. Tertullian was one of his disciples. (See Note on John xvi. 7.)

See Euseb. Ecc. Hist. and especially Tertullian.

1 CORINTHIANS xiv. 29. 31.

“ Let the prophets speak, two or three.”

(QUAKERS.)

“ To prophesy,” Mr. Tuke observes, “ is not in this sense simply to predict, but to publish the truths of the Gospel.” So Parkhurst.

“ The Quakers conclude, therefore, that so far from one individual having a right to assume the exercise of the ministry; it is but conformable to the practice of the Primitive Church, that at the same meeting several members should, one after another, exercise this office when they feel themselves moved thereto.”

1 CORINTHIANS xiv. 34.

"Women."

No. 1.

(GREEK CHURCH.)

In the religious assemblies of the Greeks, the women are always apart from the men.

Thomson's Travels.

No. 2.

(MORAVIANS.)

Wesley gives the following description of the unnatural separation of different sexes, ages, and conditions among the Moravians.

"This is carried so far, that in their burial-place there are distinct squares for married and unmarried men and women, and for male and female children, and for widows."

Wesley's Second Journal.

1 CORINTHIANS xv. 18.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ, are perished."

"What can be a stronger proof that the Apostle knew of no intermediate state, of no conscious immaterial spirit which survived the body, and might enjoy or suffer, while the body was mouldering in the grave? If there be no resurrection, there is no hope. They who died in the expectation of it will be disappointed, and will utterly perish.

"It is in vain that philosophers prate of the gross and sluggish nature of matter, and of the subtle and

ethereal essence of the soul, which, as they teach, is capable of subsisting in a conscious state, and of exerting its faculties with increased vigour, when delivered from the incumbrance of the body. The Gospel revelation teaches no such thing."

Belsham.

"By the Apostle speaking of the dead as perished, on the supposition of there being no resurrection, it is evident that he had no idea of the separate existence of the soul, independently of the body: for then death would only have been a dismissal of the immortal spirit, which would subsist, and according to the common opinion, be more free and more happy without the body than with it."

Priestley.

1 CORINTHIANS XV. 20.

"First fruits."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"It is evident, from this passage, that the resurrection of Christ is not merely to be considered as a miracle in proof of his doctrine, the principal article of which was the resurrection of all the dead, but a specimen, as it were, of the general resurrection: he being the first-fruits of a general harvest, the first who, having been dead, rose again to immortal life. But Christ could not properly be called the first-fruits of those who are to rise from the dead, if he was not of the same nature with those of whom the general harvest is to consist. In the law of Moses, the first-fruits was only the first ripe corn gathered

before the rest: Christ, therefore, must be of the same nature with us, in order to be the first-fruits from the dead, and that his resurrection may be a proper encouragement to us to expect the like. Had he been of a nature considerably different from ours, especially much superior to us, as he must have been if he had been the Creator of the world and of man, his rising again would be no proper specimen of a resurrection in which we might hope to partake; for there might be very good reasons why so great a Being as he was, could not be holden of death, which would not at all extend to us."

Priestley.

1 CORINTHIANS xv. 21.

"For since by man came death," &c.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"Adam was the father of all mankind; and he, by his fall, was the means of entailing death upon his offspring. Adam was a man like ourselves; and it is the pleasure of God that a resurrection to life should also be introduced by another man, a man like ourselves, one who was as truly and properly a man as Adam himself: even of Jesus of Nazareth, who authoritatively taught, and in his own person exemplified, a resurrection to life, honour, and immortality.

"We may here remark, that the Apostle assumes as the foundation of his analogy, the foundation of the fall of man, as recorded in the book of Genesis, and argues upon it as literally true. Whether literal or figurative, whether history or fable, whether he

did or did not admit it in the strict literal sense, it equally well serves the purpose of his argument. The Mosaic history teaches, that the fall of one man introduced death, and the resurrection of another man introduces life.

“Observe likewise, the pointed manner in which the Apostle here asserts the proper humanity of Christ. If Christ was not a man, a mere man, a man in the very same sense as Adam, then the Apostle’s assertion is untrue. If Jesus be, as many Christians believe, a superior being, the true state of the case would be, that although by man came death, the resurrection from the dead came by one who is greater than man. But the Apostle’s doctrine is the direct contrary of this: ‘As by man came death, so by man will also come a resurrection of the dead.’ It is impossible for language to express, in a more explicit manner, that Jesus of Nazareth is a man, a human being in all respects constituted like other men.”

Belsham.

1 CORINTHIANS xv. 21.

“*The resurrection.*”

(PURITANS.)

The Puritans* objected particularly to those words used in our burial service, “*In sure and cer-*

* When the Puritans were in power, and the directory had been substituted in place of the liturgy, it was ordered that burials were to be without any religious ceremony, such usages having been abused to superstition, being no way beneficial to the dead, and many ways hurtful to the living. Nevertheless, it was judged very

tain hope of the resurrection to eternal life," which, they said, were frequently pronounced over the worst of men.

See Neal's Hist. of the Puritans.

1 CORINTHIANS XV. 22.

"As in Adam all die."

No. 1.

(PELAGIUS AND CŒLESTIUS.)

In opposition to this passage, the Pelagians quote Deut. xxiv. 16. "*The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers,*" &c.

One of the tenets of Pelagius and Cœlestius, and for which Cœlestius was cited before the council assembled at Carthage, was "that Adam had been created mortal, and would have died, though he had not sinned."

See Dictionn. des Hérésies.

No. 2.

(SUBLAPSARIANS AND SUPRALAPSARIANS.)

The order in which they understand the divine decrees, has produced two distinctions of Calvinists, viz. Sublapsarians, and Supralapsarians: the former term derived from two Latin words, Sub, below or

convenient, that the Christian friends who accompanied the dead to the place appointed for public burial, should apply themselves to meditation and conferences suitable to the occasion; and the minister, if he were present, might put them in remembrance of their duty there, as upon any other opportunity. They did not intend to deny any civil respects at the burial, suitable to the rank and constitution of the deceased.—*Southey's Book of the Church.*

after, and *Lapsus*, the fall; and the latter from *Supra*, above, and *Lapsus*, the fall.

The Sublapsarians assert, that God had only permitted the first man to fall; their system of decrees, concerning election and reprobation, being, as it were, subsequent to that event; whereas the Supralapsarians maintain, that God had from all eternity decreed the transgression of Adam, in such a manner, that our first parents could not possibly avoid that fatal event, and this as a foundation of his justice and mercy.

Adam's Religious World.

No. 3.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ The Apostle suggests a remarkable analogy between the two dispensations of death and life, with respect to the nature of the persons by whom they were introduced. The fact which this analogy supposes, and upon which it is built, seems to be no other than this, that Christ, as to his nature, was in no respect different from Adam. For the proof that ‘ as by man came death, by man also came the resurrection from the dead,’ is this: that as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive. He was a man in the same sense of the word in which it was applied by St. Paul to Adam. We may reasonably presume, that the Apostle, in speaking of Adam and Christ, with respect to their natures, if he had known of any material distinction between them, would have been no less attentive to the circumstances of opposition, than to those of resemblance. That instead of saying, ‘ as by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead,’ he would have said, although by man came death, the

resurrection of the dead came by a person of a nature superior to that of man: and since no opposition of this sort appears, are we not at liberty to believe, nay, are we not obliged to acknowledge, that God has magnified his power by making him who sanctifies, and them who are sanctified, of one nature; by raising up the author of life and salvation from among the descendants of him who brought death into the world."

Tyrwhit. ap. Comment. and Essays on S. S. vol. ii. p. 15. et seq.

"And it is also very plain, that the resurrection of which the Apostle treats in this celebrated chapter, is the resurrection, not of a chosen few, of a select number, whether greater or less, but that of the whole human race. The Apostle's language is so clear and full, with respect to the final happiness of those who are thus raised, and that their resurrection to life will be ultimately a blessing, that the generality of Christians have supposed that he is here treating of the resurrection of the virtuous only. But that is not the fact: he evidently speaks of the restoration of the whole human race. All who die by Adam shall be raised by Christ: otherwise the Apostle's assertion would be untrue. The case then would have been this, as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall a select number, a small proportion, be made alive. But this is not the Apostle's doctrine. His expressions are equally universal in each clause: All die in Adam. The same all, without any exception, without any restriction, shall by Christ be restored to life, and ultimately to holiness and everlasting happiness. And to guard against the abuse of this doctrine, he proceeds to declare, that all will not be admitted at the same time to the participation of final happiness; for,

“ Though all men will be restored to life, and raised to happiness, all will not be made happy at once, but each will be advanced as he becomes qualified for his reward; till, in the end, the enemies of Christ shall be all subdued, and his authority shall be universally acknowledged and obeyed, ver. 23—26.”

Belsham.

“ Here,” says Dr. Priestley, in his note upon the text, “ the Apostle evidently considers Christ as a mere man, as much as Adam was; death being introduced by one man, and eternal life by another: It is also to be observed, that all, without exception, who die in Adam, will participate in this glorious and happy resurrection by Christ. Not, indeed, all at the same time, but each in his own order. First, Christ; afterwards, all virtuous persons and true believers, at his second coming; lastly, cometh the end, the grand consummation of all things, when all his enemies shall be put under his feet, and all things shall be subdued to him: that is, when all natural and moral evil shall be exterminated, and death shall be swallowed up in victory. This is that glorious issue of the divine administration to which the Gospel encourages us to look forward, and for which it is intended to qualify and prepare all who practically embrace it. ‘ Blessed and holy is he who hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power.’ See Chancy on Universal Salvation, p. 197.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

1 CORINTHIANS XV. 23.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“*But every one in his proper class* *.”—Belsham’s Translation.

“* *In his proper class*; εν τω ιδιω ταγματι, ‘in his own band,’ Macknight—who observes, that ταξις, not ταγμα, signifies order.

“I agree with this expositor and with Dr. Chancy (Univ. Salv. p. 197,) in thinking that three different periods are here referred to by the Apostle. 1. The resurrection of Christ himself. 2. The resurrection of the virtuous at Christ’s second appearance. 3. The grand consummation of all things; when the wicked, after having passed through the necessary state of discipline and purification, shall be restored to virtue and to happiness, and all the captives of death shall be rescued from his grasp. This appears to me to be the true key to the interpretation of the passage; of which, however, probably nothing but the event can give the true solution. In this interpretation I agree with Dr. Chancy. Dr. Macknight only conjectures that the wicked will be raised after the righteous.”

Belsham.

1 CORINTHIANS XV. 24.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“*Then will the end be, when God the Father delivereth up the kingdom to him, during which he will destroy all dominion, and all authority, and all power.*”—Wakefield.

“The received reading of this verse anticipates and is not consistent with ver. 28, nor with other

passages of the New Testament. All difficulties are avoided by the present translation, which rests on the authority of the Ethiopic version. Moreover, the Coptic and Syriac versions have *πασαν δυνάμιν*,

Wakefield.

1 CORINTHIANS xv. 25.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“For he must reign till God shall have put all enemies under his feet,”—Belsham’s Translation.

“At some fixed but unknown period, after the resurrection of the just, the termination of the present system of things will take place, and a new and happy state will be introduced. At that time, Jesus, having accomplished all the great and benevolent purposes of his delegated power, will resign his authority into the hands of the wise and gracious Parent and Sovereign of all, from whom he received it; and who will no doubt express his high approbation of the conduct of his honoured minister, and will crown his faithful services with their due reward. In other words, at the period, in question, all the glorious purposes of the Gospel Dispensation shall be complete, in the virtue and happiness of the whole human race. For, till this great event takes place, the plan of infinite mercy will be imperfect, and the dominion and conquests of the Gospel will be unfinished. The government of Christ, therefore, must continue, till he who gave him his commission has fully established his authority, and till the triumph of the Redeemer is universal and

complete. And that not only in the ultimate subjection of all mankind to the doctrine and spirit of the Gospel, and the final overthrow of all tyranny, civil and religious, of all usurpation over the rights of conscience, of all idolatry, false doctrine, and immoral practice, and in the universal prevalence of truth and goodness in the world, but in the glorious rescue of the whole human race from the dominion of the grave, and the restoration of every individual of mankind to virtue, to happiness, and to immortality."

Belsham.

1 CORINTHIANS xv. 26.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"*Inasmuch as God hath put all things under his feet; and so the enemy death will be destroyed at last.*"—Wakefield's Translation.

"I have transposed these two verses to avoid the ambiguity of the *pronouns*: and so the Ethiopic translator: and all the ancient versions but one acknowledge a connecting particle in ver. 26."

Wakefield.

"*The last enemy* shall be utterly abolished, even death.*"

Belsham's Translation.

"* *The last enemy.* Εσχατος εχθρος καταργηται ο θανατος. See Doddridge. The common translation, 'the last enemy which shall be destroyed is death,' quite loses the spirit of the passage: for of what consequence is it to know whether death be the first or the last enemy? to be assured that death itself, the

wages of sin, will be ultimately abolished, and utterly done away, by the resurrection and ultimate restitution of all mankind to virtue and happiness, is a most important discovery indeed, for which we are wholly indebted to the Christian revelation.—

‘καταργεω: otiosum reddo, 2; cessare facio, 3; abrogo, de legibus, 4; neco, destruo, Rom. vi. 6. 5; abjicio, 1 Cor. xiii. xi. 6; vinco, vim et potestatem infringo. Admodum raro occurrit hæc vox apud exteros scriptores.’ Schleusner. ‘It signifies,’ says Doddridge, ‘divesting a thing of some power, whether lawful or usurped, which it formerly had, and reducing it to an incapacity for exerting that energy any more: viz. Satan, Heb. ii. 14.; Death, 2 Tim. i. 10.; temporal princes, 1 Cor. i. 28.; the law, Eph. ii. 15.’

“ When vice is completely subdued, and all the rational creatures of God, in consequence of the process of discipline through which they have passed, shall have become virtuous and happy, the empire of death will come to a perpetual close. Natural death shall be abolished by the resurrection of all mankind to a new and immortal life; and that death also which is denounced as the punishment of sin, that second death, which is the consummation of human misery, and the bitter consequence of human guilt, those unutterable pains which may hereafter be necessary to cleanse the mind from the pollution of unrepented vice, shall likewise be utterly abolished by the restoration of all, even the most vicious and profligate of mankind, to virtue and happiness, unchangeable and everlasting. Death, in this most formidable sense, is the last enemy of the government of Christ; but even this enemy shall be totally destroyed, nor shall our victorious Leader resign the

reins of empire till this dreaded tyrant, this king of terrors, shall be subdued at his feet."

Belsham.

1 CORINTHIANS xv. 27.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"For God hath subjected all things under his feet. Ps. viii. 6."
Belsham.

"No person who attentively reads the Psalm from which the words are taken, can suppose that it is intended as a prophecy of Christ."

Belsham.

"Now when the Scripture saith, all things are put under him, it manifestly means a subjection, besides the subjection to him who put all these things under Christ."—Wakefield's Translation.

"The latter part of the 27th verse, as usually understood, is complete absurdity. The Apostle's view was to prove the *mediatorial kingdom* of the *Messiah* from this part of Scripture here quoted. This power of *εκτος* will, I hope, be ascertained on some future opportunity."

Wakefield.

"We see here how peremptorily the Apostle rejects the supposition of the equality of Christ to the Father; from whom he received all the authority which he now exercises, and to whom he is ultimately to resign it again. He appears to regard it as a notion which could never for a moment be ad-

mitted into the mind of a person of common understanding."

Belsham.

1 CORINTHIANS xv. 29.

(UNITARIANISM.)

" Besides, what advantage above the other dead will they have, who are submitting constantly to baptism? Why indeed are they thus baptized, if the dead will certainly live no more?"

Wakefield's Translation.

"The Apostle here begins a new argument for the resurrection, grounded on the practice of the Apostles themselves, who had been eye-witnesses themselves of their master's revival. And this passage appears now plain, rational, and convincing; a passage which, I presume, was not intelligible before. What contributed not a little to obscure it was the second *ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν*, a clause not acknowledged by the Coptic and Ethiopic versions. I have adopted also that construction and distribution of the sentences which seemed to display the reasoning to most advantage. For this sense of baptism (here understood in a sense of suffering,) the reader may consult Matt. xx. 22.; Luke xii. 50.; Euseb. Ecc. Hist. vi. 4. Fin.; and for an illustration of the argument, Rev. xx. 4."

Wakefield.

1 CORINTHIANS xv. 40. 42. 44. 50.

(QUAKERS.)

“ We believe in ‘ the resurrection of a body,’ though not of the same body which dies.”

Take on the Doctrines of the Quakers.

“ And we also believe the resurrection of the just and unjust; the one to salvation, and the other to condemnation; according unto the judgment of the great day; and then shall every seed have its own body, according to 1 Cor. xv. 36, 37, which we verily believe. For if the dead rise not, we are of all men most miserable. But because we dare not be so foolishly inquisitive, as to say, with what bodies shall they rise; therefore do some say, we deny both the resurrection of the body of Christ, and of all that are or shall be dead. But this also is false; for every man shall be raised in his own order: but Christ, the first fruits, 1 Cor. xv. 23. And we believe they shall be raised with the same bodies, *as far as natural and spiritual, corruptible and incorruptible, terrestrial and celestial, can be the same.*”

*See a Declaration of our Faith who are called Quakers, written by
E. B. J. C. W. D. H. S. (A. D. 1668.)*

1 CORINTHIANS xv. 44.

“ *It is raised a spiritual body.*”

No. 1.

(BARDESANES.)

Bardeanes, in conformity with his doctrine of the soul of man having been united to a body of flesh after the fall only, maintained, that we shall not rise with the body which we had when on earth,

but with such a subtile and celestial body as is the proper habitation of a pure and innocent soul.

See Origen Dial. contr. Marcion.

No. 2.

(SWEDENBORG.)

“There are two worlds, the natural and the spiritual, entirely distinct, though perfectly corresponding to each other. At death, a man enters into the spiritual world, when his soul is clothed with a substantial body, in opposition to the present material body, which is never to rise out of the grave. After death, a man is so little changed, that he even does not know but that he is living in the present world. He eats and drinks, and even enjoys conjugal delight as in this world. The resemblance between the two worlds is so great, that in the spiritual world there are cities, with palaces and houses; and also writings and books, employments and merchandizes; gold, silver, and precious stones; in a word, there is, in the spiritual world, all and every thing that there is in the natural world; but in heaven, such things are in an infinitely more perfect state.”

Baron Swedenborg.

I CORINTHIANS xv. 45.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“And thus saith the Scripture, the first man, Adam, became a living animal, the last Adam, is a life-giving spirit.”*

Belsham's Translation.

“It is evident, that the Apostle here speaks of the life of which Adam became possessed in consequence of God's breathing into him, what Moses

calls the breath of life, as nothing more than what we call animal life, such as brutes are possessed of, who are likewise said to have living souls; that is, it was such a life as should have an end. It is evident, therefore, that he had no view to any immaterial principle infused into man, for then brutes must be possessed of an immaterial principle too. But Christ, who is here called the last Adam, became, after his resurrection, a being no more liable to corruption or death. This the Apostle, not knowing how else to characterize, calls, in opposition to the present animal body, a spirit endued with a principle of immortal life; and, moreover, as the words literally imply, having a power of imparting it to others."

Priestley.

"* *The last Adam.*—Rosenmuller mentions some commentators, Harduinus, Jehnius, Kranzius, and others, who deny that Jesus is ever called Adam in the writings of Paul, and who refer to Rom. v. 15. 17. 21, where an antithesis is kept up between the benefits derived to mankind through Christ, and the loss sustained by Adam's fall; but in which Christ is not spoken of as the second Adam. By this phrase, therefore, these writers understand either Adam himself after his resurrection, who will then be a model for all his posterity; or rather, in the abstract, man himself, after he has been restored to life; the risen and glorified human being, viz. the second Adam is a quickening spirit, 'ideo appellari dicunt, quoniam spiritum censemus causam vivendi, agendi, movendi, in se habere, nec aliunde petere,' because a spirit is supposed to have a principle of life and motion in itself, independent of any thing external."

Belsham.

1 CORINTHIANS xv. 46.

"That was not first," &c.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"What becomes of that assertion, that Adam was created immortal? and how will it be made to consist with the Apostle's decision in this place? It will not be sufficient to allege, that he was created immortal, but that he lost this privilege by his offence; for the Apostle is evidently speaking of his formation, and refers to his being taken out of the ground, for which reason he calls him earthy. Adam then had an animal body before the fall—a body composed of flesh and blood, and of consequence mortal and corruptible." See Mr. Belsham's Translation, &c.

Alexander.

1 CORINTHIANS xv. 47.

"The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven."

No. 1.

An anonymous writer, who partly adopted the errors of Theodotus (See Note on Heb. v. 6.) concluded from the text, that there are men terrestrial and men celestial; and that, as St. Paul informs us, that Melchisedec was made like unto Jesus Christ, it follows, that Melchisedec was also a man celestial, which he concludes, clearly explains the Scriptural account of wise men coming to adore Jesus Christ.

As the Scriptures enter into no detail of these wise men, the writer alluded to has concluded, that

these wise men were three celestial men, viz. Melchisedec, Enoch, and Elias.

See Diction. des Hérésies Art. Melchisédecien.

No. 2.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"The first man was from the ground, earthy: the second man will be from heaven, heavenly."—Unitarian Version.

"The word *Κυριος* (Lord) is wanting in the Vatican, Ephr. Clermont, and many other manuscripts, and in the most ancient versions; and is marked by Griesbach as probably an interpolation. The word *οὐρανιος* (heavenly) is found in some good MSS. and in the Ethiopic and Vulgate versions. By introducing it, the latter clause of the verse better corresponds with the former. Marcion is accused by Tertullian of inserting the word *Κυριος*."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

1 CORINTHIANS xv. 52.

"We shall be changed."

(ORIGEN.)

Origen supposed, that after the resurrection, all bodies will be of a round figure.

Maelaine's Note.

1 CORINTHIANS xv. 53.

“ This mortal must put on immortality.”

(PHILOPONUS.)

Philoponus maintained, that the *form*, as well as the *matter*, of all bodies, was *generated* and corrupted; and that both, therefore, were to be restored in the resurrection. Conon held, on the contrary, that the body never lost its *form*; that its *matter* alone was subject to corruption and decay, and was, consequently, to be restored when “ this mortal shall put on immortality.”

Photii Biblioth. Cod. 24. Asseman. Biblioth. Orient. Vatica. tom. ii. p. 329.

1 CORINTHIANS xvi. 19.

“ The Church that is in their house.”

(BROWNISTS.)

Every church or society of Christians was, according to the Brownists *, a body corporate, hav-

* Robert Brown, the father of this sect, travelled up and down the country in company with his assistant, Richard Harrison, preaching against Bishops, Ceremonies, Ecclesiastical Courts, or ordaining of ministers, &c. [on which account he boasted of having been committed to thirty-two Prisons.]

Brown afterwards settled at Middleburg, in Flushing, where he formed a church according to his own model. His followers became divided among themselves, insomuch that Brown being weary of his office, returned into England in the year 1589, and having renounced his principles of separation, became rector of a church in Northamptonshire.

Notwithstanding the return of Brown to the Church of England,

ing full power within itself to admit and exclude members, to choose and ordain officers ; and when the good of the society required it, to depose them, without being accountable to classes, convocations, synods, councils, or any jurisdiction whatsoever.

They denied the Church of England to be a true church, and her ministers to be rightly ordained.

They maintained the discipline of the Church of England to be Popish and Anti-christian, and all her ordinances and sacraments invalid.

Neal's History of the Puritans.

his principles were adopted by many during the latter part of Queen Elizabeth's reign, and also by a considerable body of the Puritans in the next age.

The Brownists did not differ from the Church of England in any Articles of Faith ; but were very rigid and narrow in points of discipline.

SECOND CORINTHIANS.

~~REMARKS~~

2 CORINTHIANS ii. 10.

"I also."

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

"The Apostle here granted an indulgence, or pardon, *in the person*, and by the authority of Christ, to the incestuous Corinthian, whom before he had put under penance; which pardon consisted in a releasing of part of the temporal punishment due to his sin."

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.



2 CORINTHIANS ii. 11.

"Satan."

No. 1.

(CELSUS.)

Celsus, the first Pagan writer against Christianity, casts an imputation upon the Christians for derogating from Divine Omnipotence, in that their hypothesis of an adversary power.

"The Christians," he says, "are erroneously led into most wicked opinions concerning God, by rea-

son of their great ignorance of the divine enigmas, whilst they make a certain adversary to God, whom they call the devil, and in the Hebrew language, Satan; and affirm, contrary to all piety, that the greatest God, having a mind to do good to men, is disabled or withstood by an adversary resisting him."

Cudworth, book i. c. 4. p. 270.

No. 2.

(BARDESANES.)

Bardesanes, who lived in the second century, was occupied with the philosophers and theologians of his time in solving the grand question,—“Why does evil exist in the world?”

He contended, that it was absurd to say that God was the cause of evil. It was necessary, therefore, to suppose, that the cause was unconnected with God. According to him, this cause was Satan or the devil, whom Bardesanes regarded as the enemy of God, but not his creature.

● *See Dictionnaire des Hérésies.*

By far the greater part of the Heretics of the second century were Gnostics, and derived their errors from the mixture of Christianity with the Oriental philosophy.

Their tenets are represented as so many different modifications of that fantastical system.

The followers of Saturninus and Basilides spread themselves over Syria and Egypt, and propagated the doctrine of a good and evil principle.

See Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. c. 30. p. 151. Origen Dial. contra Marcionitas, sect. iii. p. 70. edit. Wetstenii, Frid. Strunzii Hist. Bardesanes, &c.—Beausobre, Hist. du Manich. vol. ii. p. 128.

No. 3.

(PRISCILLIANISTS.)

The Priscillianists, who continued as a sect during several centuries, derived their denomination from Priscillian, who was Bishop of Abila in the fourth century.

A considerable mixture of Gnosticism and Unitarianism appears to have been united in this sect, with the tenets of both of which, however, they were imperfectly acquainted. They thought the devil was not made by God, but arose from chaos and darkness; said, that the bodies of men were made by the devil; condemned marriage, and denied the resurrection of the body; asserted, that the soul was of a divine substance, which, having offended in heaven, was sent into the body as a place of punishment; that men are subject to necessity, to sin, and to the power of the stars; and our bodies compounded according to the order of the twelve signs of the Zodiac. They agreed that the Son is inferior to the Father, and that there was a time when the Son was not. The rule of manners prescribed by this sect, was remarkably austere.

Leo Opera, p. 167. Aug. de Hæres, c. 70.

No. 4.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“*That we may not be overreached by the adversary* *, *for we are not ignorant of his wiles.*”—Belsham’s Translation.

“* *The Adversary.*—Satan, the opposer, i. e. not an evil spirit, but their unbelieving neighbours, Jews, and Heathens, who would take advantage of their intestine divisions to disparage the Christian religion.”

Belsham.

“ By *Satan* or *Adversary*, the Apostle means the civil abettors of the Pagan superstition.”

Harwood.

“ By Satan, we are to understand any adversary; and Christianity had many of them in that and indeed in every age. And whatever man or thing has a tendency to obstruct a good design, is called Satan, or something equivalent to it, in the Scriptures. Thus our Lord called Peter, Satan, when he would have diverted him from his resolution to die at Jerusalem. We are not, therefore, to infer from such passages as these, that there is, in the universe, a great evil spirit, the rival of the Supreme Being, and continually thwarting him in his designs; more especially prompting men to all vice and wickedness here, in order to be the instrument of their punishment hereafter. The vices of mankind are not to be excused in this manner; as if they were drawn into sin by some invisible agent, to whose powers their own were by no means equal. Men's own depraved appetites are sufficient to account for all the wickedness there is in this world.”

Priestley.

Farmer, in his Essay on Demoniacs, makes a similar remark.



2 CORINTHIANS iii. 1.

“ *Epistles of commendation.*”

(WESLEY.)

“ To each of those,” said Wesley, “ of whose seriousness and good conversation I found no reason

to doubt, I gave a testimony under my own hand, by writing their name on a ticket prepared for that purpose; every ticket implying as strong a recommendation of the person to whom it was given, as if I had written at length, 'I believe the bearer hereof to be one that fears God, and works righteousness.'

"Those who bore these tickets, (these *Συμβόλα* or *Tesseræ*, as the ancients termed them, being of just the same force with the *ἐπιστολαὶ ἀνστατικαὶ*, commendatory letters, mentioned by the Apostle) wherever they came, were acknowledged by the brethren, and received with all cheerfulness.

"These were likewise of use in other respects; by these it was easily distinguished when the society were to meet apart—who were members of it and who not. These also supplied us with a quiet and inoffensive method of removing any disorderly member.

"He has no new ticket at the quarterly visitation, (for so often the tickets are changed), and hereby it is immediately known, that he is no longer of this community."

Wesley's Account of the People called Methodists, in a letter to the Rev. Mr. Perronet.



2 CORINTHIANS iv. 4.

"God of this world."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"i. e. A worldly selfish spirit, or an attachment to inveterate prejudices, expressed figuratively and allegorically, as though that imaginary being, who is represented as the ruler of that portion of mankind

who oppose the Gospel had fascinated and blinded their eyes against the light of truth."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

2 CORINTHIANS iv. 4.

"image of God."

(BARDESANES.)

According to Bardesanes, God had created the world and man; but the man whom he had formed in the beginning, was not the man clothed with flesh, but the human soul united to a subtle body, conformable to its nature.

It was this soul which had been formed after the image of God, and which, surprised by the wiles of the devil, had transgressed the law of God, and was consequently driven from Paradise, and united to a carnal body, which became its prison.

Bardesanes said, that this was the meaning of the garments of skin with which God is said to have covered Adam and Eve after the fall.

See Hist. Bardesanis et Bardesanistarum.

2 CORINTHIANS v. 1.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"For we know, that if this tabernacle wherein we dwell, which is fixed on the ground, be taken to pieces, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the Heavens."

Wakefield's Translation.

"On this passage the reader may consult my Silva Critica i. sect. 44."

Wakefield.

2 CORINTHIANS v. 8.

“ To be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord.”

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ That is, to quit the present state, and to enter upon that state of recompence and happiness which we are to enjoy with Christ. This text is usually understood as expressing the Apostle’s persuasion, that death is a separation of the soul from the body, and his expectation, that the separate spirit would be introduced into a state of glory and happiness in the presence of Christ, while the body is perishing in the grave. But it is quite impossible that this should be the Apostle’s meaning, as he had expressly declared in his former epistle, 1 Cor. xv. 18, that if there be no resurrection of the dead, all who have fallen asleep in Christ have perished; which is palpably inconsistent with their possessing life and happiness in a separate state; and the Apostle cannot be supposed to contradict himself. And in truth, the Apostle’s language in this passage will not bear the construction which is usually given to it; and gives no countenance to the doctrine of an intermediate state of perception, activity and enjoyment between death and the resurrection. He is here only contrasting the present state of trial and suffering, with the future promised state of happy existence in the presence of Christ. He never once mentions, or even glances at, an intermediate state, in which the spirit will be happy, when separate from the body. On the contrary, he represents the state which immediately succeeds to death, as a state of nakedness, ver. 3, which was so far from being the object of his wish, that he expresses his earnest desire to

be exempted from it, by being permitted to continue in the world till the appearance of Christ. That the Apostle regarded the season of rest in the grave as an evanescent point, hardly worthy of notice when compared with the glory which was to succeed, cannot reasonably be doubted. See Phil. i. 23. But this is to be attributed to a prevailing, but erroneous opinion, that Christ would appear to judgment before the generation which then existed should expire, rather than to the speculative, however correct opinion, that the idea of duration ceases while thought is suspended. We have no reason to believe that the Apostle was a profound metaphysician."

Belsham.

2 CORINTHIANS v. 10.

"We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every man may receive the things done in his body," &c.

No. 1.

(HIERAX.)

Hierax, the Egyptian, excluded from the kingdom of heaven, children who had died before they arrived to the use of reason, and that upon the supposition, that God was bound to administer the rewards of futurity to those who had fairly finished their victorious conflict with the body and its lusts.

Epiphan. Hæres. 67, Hieracitarum.

No. 2.

(JULIAN.)

Julian, who adopted the opinions of Pelagius, quoted this passage in opposition to St. Augustine.

Julian concludes from these words, that children

who have done neither good nor evil, would not appear with adults ; and that being incapable of crime, they would not be exposed to punishment.

The Pelagians had asserted, that the doctrine of original sin was contrary to the justice of God ; they had said, that if concupiscence were an evil and an effect of sin ; in a word, if all children were born in sin, as their adversaries asserted, then it was necessary to acknowledge, that marriage, which is the effect, and which becomes the source of this sin, is an evil and a disorder.

St. Augustine had replied to this difficulty, in his first book on marriage and concupiscence.

Julian read this book, and asserted, that the principles of St. Augustine lead to Manicheism ; he undertook to prove, that according to the principles of the Catholics, as well as the system of the Manicheans, marriage was an evil ; that man, in conformity with the system of original sin, as well as the system of Manes, was born determined to evil ; and that if a child were born criminal, and worthy of hell for a sin which he had it not in his power to avoid, then it was necessary to acknowledge, that the God of the Catholics was as wicked and relentless as the evil principle of the Manicheans.

Aug. in Julian. lib. i. cap. 4. &c.

No. 3.

(WESLEY.)

Wesley thought it probable (he said) that the judgment would last several thousand years, that the place would be above the earth, and that the circumstances of every individual's life would then be brought forth in full view, together with all their tempers, and all the desires, thoughts, and intents of

their hearts. This he thought absolutely necessary for the full display of the glory of God, for the clear and perfect manifestation of his wisdom, justice, power and mercy.

See Southey's Life of Wesley ; Life of Mr. Wesley by Dr. Whitehead, and another by Dr. Coke and Mr. Moore.

2 CORINTHIANS v. 10.

“ Things done in his body.”

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

“ In the particular judgment immediately after death, the soul is rewarded or punished according to what she has done in the body.”

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

2 CORINTHIANS v. 17.

“ Old things are past away ; behold, all things are become new.”

(AMALRIC.)

The following tenets are said to have been introduced by the disciples of Amalric :

“ That the power of the Father had continued only during the Mosaic dispensation, that of the Son 1200 years after his entrance upon earth; and that, in the thirteenth century, *the age of the Holy Spirit* commenced, in which the sacraments, and all external worship were to be abolished.

Fleury Hist. Eccles. c. 76. sect. 59.

2 CORINTHIANS v. 19.

“ God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself.”

No. 1.

The peculiar opinions which that extraordinary man, William Law, entertained in the latter part of his life, were these, “ That all the attributes of the Almighty are only modifications of his love; and that when in Scripture, his wrath, vengeance, &c. are spoken of, such expressions are only used in condescension to human weakness, by the way of adapting the subject of the mysterious workings of God’s providence to human capacities. He held, therefore, that God punishes no one. All evil, according to his creed, originates either from matter, or from the free-will of man: and if there be suffering, it is not that God wills it, but that he permits it, (for the sake of a greater overbalance of good that could not otherwise possibly be produced,) as the necessary consequence of an inert instrument like matter, and the imperfection of creatures less pure than himself. Upon his system all beings will finally be happy. He utterly rejects the doctrine of atonement, and ridicules the supposition that the offended justice of the one perfect supreme being requires any satisfaction. His theory is, that man, by withdrawing himself from God, had lost the divine life in his soul, and that all communication between him and his maker was nearly lost. In order to remedy this, in order to make some mysterious way to re-open an intercourse between the deity and the soul of man; and finally, in order to afford the soul a more near, and, as it were, sensible

perception of its maker, the second person in the trinity became man. Law alleges that St. Paul, when he speaks of redemption, says, "God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself." Now, he adds, had the Almighty required an atonement, the converse of this proposition would have been the truth, and the phrase would have been reconciling himself to the world.

The narration of the fall of man, he regards as an allegory. He believes that the first human being was a creature combining both sexes in its own perfect nature, and possessing an infinite capacity of happiness: the fall, he thinks, consisted, not in tasting of any forbidden fruit, but in turning from God as the whole source of joy, and in a sensual desire for a second-self. And in support of this notion, he adduces the text, And God made man of the dust of the earth, male and female created he them, a text which occurs before the formation of the woman is mentioned. Had it not been for this fault, Law supposes that the human race would have increased in number, as much as it has done, by a certain delegated power, which would have enabled man to create others after his own image.

These whimsies, which Law derived from Jacob Behmen, are entirely confined to the two tracts, entitled the "Spirit of Love," and the "Spirit of Prayer," or "the soul rising out of time into the riches of eternity." Whatever inference may be drawn from them with regard to his judgment, or his sanity, as a practical religious writer, (in which character he exclusively appears in his "Serious Call," and his "Christian Perfection,") there are few men whose writings breathe a more genuine spirit of gospel love, and whose sentiments and mode of in-

culcating them, at once simple and manly, appeal more forcibly to the heart.

See Southey's Life of Wesley, Note 13.

No. 2.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"For it is God who is reconciling the world to himself in Christ, by not imputing their sins unto them."—Wakefield's Translation.

"It is to be observed that it is here said, that God was reconciling the world to himself by Christ. There was no occasion to reconcile God to the world. He was always disposed to be at peace with men, whenever they should repent and turn to him. All that was wanting, therefore, was to bring men to repentance and reformation by preaching the gospel."

Priestley.

2 CORINTHIANS v. 21.

"He hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."

No. 1.

(ANTINOMIANS.)

The Antinomians assert, that by God's laying our iniquities upon Christ, he became as completely sinful as we, and we as completely righteous as Christ.

Gregory's History of the Christian Church.

No. 2.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ For God hath appointed him, who knew no sin, to be a sin-offering for us, that we by him might be justified before God.”

Belsham's Translation.

“ A sin-offering for us. Gr. sin, i. e. sin-offering. See Hosea iv. 8.; Heb. ix. 26. 28. Sin-offerings were appointed for sins of ignorance only; see Lev. iv. and Jennings's Jewish Antiquities, vol. i. p. 328. This shows how little foundation this text affords for the wild supposition that Jesus upon the cross was regarded as a sinner, and bore the punishment due to the sins of men. ‘ The Rabbis limit the law to those sins of ignorance, which, if they had been committed knowingly and wilfully, would have incurred the penalty of cutting off.’ The offering, therefore, of the victim was a symbol of restoration to communion and to covenant with God. So the death of Christ may be considered figuratively as the ratification of the new covenant by the Gospel. The sin-offering for a ruler was a kid without blemish. So Christ was a lamb without blemish and without spot. He knew no sin, he had committed no transgression, by which his covenant privileges had been forfeited.”

Belsham.

“ Sin for us; That is, Christ who had never violated the law suffered death as a transgressor, that we gentiles, who as such were regarded as sinners and outlaws, might be justified or acquitted, and admitted to the privileges of the Gospel covenant. By the death of Christ the new covenant was ratified, the blessings of which are offered equally to Jews

and Gentiles. The Apostle in writing to the Gentiles expresses himself in the first person, as one of their number. See Locke's preface to the Epistles, p. 6. In all this there is no allusion to the commonly received doctrine of atonement by vicarious suffering."

Note to the Unitarian Version.



2 CORINTHIANS vi. 6.

"By the Holy Ghost."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"By a holy spirit."—Belsham's Translation.

"By holy affections."—Wakefield's Translation.

"By a well-regulated spirit."—Macknight.



2 CORINTHIANS vii. 11.

"What carefulness is wrought in you ; yea, what clearing of yourselves," &c.

Dr. Doddridge observes from Gataker, that " Calvin and Reynolds, and some other divines of note, have been misled, by taking it for granted that these verses contain *seven* distinct marks of true repentance, to be found in every sincere penitent."

2 CORINTHIANS viii. 9.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ For ye know the gracious goodness of our Lord, that while he was rich.”—Wakefield and Unitarian Version.

“ While he was rich ; πλουσιος ων, επτωχευσε. The construction requires it to be understood, not of a passage from a preceding state of wealth to a succeeding state of poverty, but of two contemporary states. He was rich and poor at the same time. πτωχευω, mendicus sum, mendicus vivo. Steph. Thesaur. inops dego; Constantin. Lex. επτωχευσε, ‘ pauper fuit, sive potius, mendicavit.’ Erasmus. The word properly signifies an actual state, not a change of state. Literally, he was poor, or he was a beggar. See Odyss. O. i. 308. Our Lord was rich in miraculous powers, which he could employ if he pleased to his own advantage. But for the benefit of his followers he chose to lead a life of poverty and dependence, to deny himself the comforts and luxuries of life for the good of others. See Grotius in loc. This was a very proper example to the Corinthians, which they might feel and imitate. It was certainly much more pertinent and applicable, than a supposed descent from a prior state of existence and felicity, to which there could be nothing analogous in the case of the Corinthians, and to which the Apostle cannot in reason, nor in consistence with grammatical construction, be understood as making the least allusion.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

2 CORINTHIANS xl. 3.

“ *The serpent.* ”

No. 1. (OPHITES, OR SERPENTINIANS.)

A branch of the Egyptian Gnostics, (who imagined that the world was created not by God, but by the Demiurgus,) rejected the Old Testament as the law of the Demiurgus, and lavished their praises on the Serpent that tempted our first parents to disobey him, and upon Cain, Korah, and others, represented as profligate and wicked. These they considered as honoured opposers of the infernal Creator. They detested Moses as one actuated by him, and who only sought his own authority and honour, not the welfare of mankind.

They were called Ophites, or Serpentinians, as they maintained, that the Serpent, by which our first parents were deceived, was either Christ himself, or Sophia, concealed under the form of that animal. In the celebration of the Eucharist they used bread, around which the serpent (which they kept in a cage) had been entwined. After the adoration of the serpent, they offered, through him, a hymn of praise to the celestial Father, and thus concluded their mysteries.

See Origen, l. vi. cont. Cels. Philastr. c. i. Epiph. Hær. 39, Damascen, c. 37, de Hær.—Dictionn. des Hérésies, Art. Ophites.

No. 2. (UNITARIANISM.)

“ The Apostle gives no hint that the Serpent was the Devil. He alludes to the narrative of the Fall

as to a story well known, but he by no means vouches for the truth of it as an historical fact."

Belsham.

2 CORINTHIANS xi. 14.

*"Satan himself is transformed into an Angel of light *."*

(UNITARIANISM.)

"The connexion shews, that by Satan here, is to be understood the chief opponent of Paul, whom he compares, in the third verse, to the serpent who deceived Eve, and describes, by the phrase, '*he that cometh to preach another Jesus,*' in the fourth verse. This Satan, or leading adversary, transforms himself into an angel of light, or assumes the character of a messenger of Jehovah. The argument is this: 'since their chief arrogates the character of a messenger of God, it is no wonder that his ministers pretend to be Apostles of the Messiah.' Simpson's Ess. on Scrip. p. 162."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

"* *Angel of light.*—It is not easy to say what it is which the Apostle alludes to in this place; but I think it is most probable that he had an eye to the Book of Job, in which it is said, chap. i. 6. that there was a day when the sons of God, i. e. angels, came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan came also among them, appearing, perhaps, as one of them; though he was well known to God, who addressed him in his proper character. I need not observe, that the whole of this representation is an allegory, founded on the idea of God keeping a court like that of an Eastern prince, and holding on certain days what we now call a levee, when his

chief ministers attend upon him, to show their respect and to receive his orders; so that we are by no means authorised to infer the real existence, either of Satan or his angels, from this figurative description."

Priestley.

2 CORINTHIANS xii. 8.

"I besought the Lord thrice."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"The person to whom Paul addressed himself at this time, was probably Christ, whom he saw in his vision. But this is far from authorising us to pray to Christ when we do not see him, and cannot know that he is present to hear us; or authorised to do any thing for us if he did. It is God only, that great Being, who is styled the God and Father of Jesus Christ, and to whom he always prayed, that is the proper object of our prayers."

Priestley.

"I earnestly prayed to God to be delivered from it."—Hammond.

This interpretation is adopted by Mr. Lindsey, who observes, "that the Apostles were not so exact in the use of the words, 'Lord,' 'Saviour,' and the like, which they indifferently gave, both to God and Christ, never supposing that any would mistake their Lord and Master, so lately born and living amongst men, to be the Supreme God and object of worship."

Lindsey's Apology, p. 147.

“ It seems indeed not improbable, that the Apostle had occasionally a real and personal intercourse with Christ. See Gal. i. 12.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

2 CORINTHIANS xiii. 14.

“ *Holy Ghost.*”

No. 1.

(GREEK CHURCH.)

The Greeks maintain, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father only, and not from the Son.

With the exception of their not acknowledging the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, this may be considered as the main point of difference between them and the Church of Rome.

The lasting and total separation between the Greek and Latin Churches, took place in the ninth century.

The Oriental or Greek Church, is the most ancient of all Christian churches; for though it may be granted, that the Roman Pontiff had acquired a spiritual, or rather a temporal jurisdiction, before the Patriarch of Constantinople, and perhaps before any other Oriental Patriarch, yet it cannot be doubted, that the first Christian Church or society was established at Jerusalem.

The next churches were, doubtless, those of Syria and Greece; and if ever St. Peter* was at Rome, which has not yet been fully ascertained, it

* That St. Peter was ever at Rome, has been warmly disputed by some learned Protestants.—See the arguments on both sides in Broughton's Hist. lib. v. 1. under Art. Church of Rome.

was not till after he had been Bishop of Antioch; so that the Latin Church is, unquestionably, the daughter of the Greek; and is indebted to her for all the blessings of the Gospel; a truth which one of her own Bishops acknowledged in the council of Trent*.

The society of Christians living in religious communion with the Patriarch of Constantinople, is, properly speaking, the Greek; though it assumes likewise the title of the Eastern church.

This society is subdivided into two branches, of which the one acknowledges the supreme authority and jurisdiction of the Bishop of Constantinople; while the other, though joined in communion of doctrine and worship with that Prelate, yet refuses to receive his legates or to obey his edicts, and is governed by its own laws and institutions, under the jurisdiction of spiritual rulers, who are independent of all foreign authority.

That part of the Greek Church which acknowledges the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Constantinople, is divided, as in the earlier ages of Christianity, into four large districts or provinces;—Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem; over each of which a Bishop presides, with the title of Patriarch, whom the inferior Bishops and monastic orders unanimously respect as their common father. But the supreme chief of all these Patriarchs, Bishops, and Abbots, and, generally speaking, of the whole church, is the Patriarch of Constantinople †.

* “Eia igitur Græcia mater nostra, cui id totum debet quod habet Latina Ecclesia.”—Oratio Episc. Bitont. in Conc. Trid. habita.

† Sir P. Ricaut says, that the Patriarch of Constantinople has “no power over the dioceses of the other Patriarchs. Every one (of the four Patriarchs) is supreme within his own jurisdiction; and if they

The other part of the Greek Church, though adopting her doctrines and ceremonies, yet is entirely free from the jurisdiction and authority of the Patriarch of Constantinople; and comprehends the Russians, Georgians, and Mingrelians.

No. 2.

There have been many and long disputes, particularly in the eighth and ninth centuries, respecting the words, "Filioque," "and from the Son," added to the creed of Constantinople*.

Dr. Maclaine observes, that this addition of the words, "filioque," to the symbol of Nice and Constantinople, was made in the fifth and sixth centuries by the churches of Spain; and their example was followed by most of the Gallican churches, where the symbol was read and sung with this addition.

No. 3.

(PHOTINUS.)

Among other errors, Photinus, in the fourth century, denied that the Holy Spirit was a distinct

all meet together in one place, they mutually kiss one another's hands."—Father Simon's Crit. Hist. p. 16, from Metrop. Critoptulus in Ep. Doctr. Eccl. Orient.

"In the space of two years that I staid at Constantinople," says M. Grelot, "two different Patriarchs gave for the patriarchship, the one 50,000, the other 60,000 crowns, as a present to the Grand Signior."—Voyage to Constantinople, p. 138, &c.

* This Creed, which has been distinguished by the appellation of the Nicene, is that which is used in the English Liturgy under that title; but is, in fact, the Confession of Faith drawn up at Constantinople.—Bingham Ecc. Antiq. b. x. c. 4.

person; and affirmed, that he was a celestial virtue, proceeding from the Deity.

See Epiph. Hæres. 71. M. Larroque, de Photino, &c. F. Ittigius

all' (Hæres. 71. Historia Photini, &c. :

No. 4.

(ARIANS.)

The Arians believe, that the Holy Ghost is not God, but the creature of the Son, begotten and created by him, and inferior in dignity to the Father and the Son.

In their doxologies, they ascribe glory to the Father through the Son.

See Adam's Religious World, &c.

The opinions of Arius, concerning the Holy Ghost, are not well known.

Mosheim.

No. 5.

(SOCINI.)

Lælius and Faustus Socinus held the phrase, "Holy Spirit," or "Holy Ghost," to be merely a figurative mode of expression, to denote the power or energy of God.

Sandii Biblioth. Anti. Trin. S. Przypcopii vita Socini.

No. 6.

(CAMPANUS.)

In the sixteenth century, Campanus taught, among other things, that "the Holy Ghost was not the title of a Divine Person, but a denomination used to denote the nature of the Father and the Son, whom he represented as inferior to the Father."

See the Dissertation de Joh. Campano, Antitrinitario, in the Amœnitates Literariæ of Schelhornius, tom. xi. p. 1—92.

No. 7.

(SERVETUS.)

According to Servetus, (who was inhumanly burnt by the advice of Calvin, as is well known) “ The Deity, before the creation of the world, had produced within himself two *personal representations*, or *manners of existence*, (which representations, &c. Servetus also called *Æconomies, Dispensations, Dispositions*) which were to be the *medium* of intercourse between him and mortals, and by whom consequently, he was to reveal his will, and to display his mercy and beneficence to the children of men; that these two representatives were the *Word* and the *Holy Ghost*; that the former was united to the man Christ, who was born of the Virgin Mary by an omnipotent act of the divine will; and that, on this account, Christ might be properly called God; that the *Holy Spirit* directed the course, and animated the whole system of nature; and more especially produced in the minds of men wise councils, virtuous propensities, and divine feelings; and finally, that these two *Representations* were to cease after the destruction of this terrestrial globe, and to be absorbed into the *substance* of the *Deity*, whence they had been formed.”

See Historia Michaelis Serveti, quam, Præsides J. L. Mosheimeo, Abbate, &c. placido Doctorum examini publice exponit Henricus ab Allwaerden.

No. 8.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ *Participation of the Holy Spirit.*”—Belsham’s Translation.

Dr. Priestley explains the passage thus; “ May all the blessings of the Gospel, the love of God, and

the participation of the gifts of his Spirit, attend you all. For the phrase, Holy Spirit, has no other meaning in the New Testament; it never means any direct influence of God upon the mind, and such as many persons expect even at this day."

Priestley.

"Upon the whole, it is sufficiently evident, in the first place, that it is highly improper to use these words of the Apostle as a general form of benediction at the close of our public assemblies for Christian worship, as the gifts of the Holy Spirit are now withdrawn. And farther, that this text, so far from supplying an argument in favour of the distinct personality of the Holy Spirit, militates directly against it; for the participation of a person is absolutely unintelligible."

Belsham.

"The favour of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the partaking of the Holy Spirit, be with you all."

Unitarian Version.

GALATIANS.

GALATIANS i. 1.

“Not of men,” &c.

No. 1.

(QUAKERS.)

The Quakers, in conformity with their usage of having no *appointed* minister, but, on the contrary, of allowing any person, either male or female, to undertake that sacred office, believe that the call, which is not of men, is *inwardly* and *immediately* received by the true ministers, and that in the discharge of the duties of this sacred office, the *renewed* influence of divine wisdom and strength should be waited for and experienced.

“ Friends are not therefore satisfied with any general impression that it is their duty to preach the Gospel; nor do they venture, under such impression, either to employ their own intellectual exertions as a preparation for the service, or to select their own time for performing it. If it be the Divine will that they should minister, they believe it will be manifested to them by the Divine Spirit, when they are to speak, whom they are to address, and what things

they are to express. In the exercise of so high and sacred a function, they dare not depend either in a greater or less degree upon their own strength or wisdom, but they feel constrained to place their sole reliance upon him who ‘hath the key of David;’ who ‘openeth, and no man shutteth, and shutteth, and no man openeth.’ Rev. iii. 7.”

See Tuke and Gurney.

“Although the gifts of the Holy Spirit were in early times miraculously communicated by the laying on of the hands of the Lord’s inspired servants, there is nothing in Scripture which justifies in any degree the merely human appointment of the preachers of the Gospel. Paul declares that he was an Apostle, ‘not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father, who raised him from the dead.’ Gal. i. 1. Such was the case with Paul; nor could it be otherwise with the Apostles in general, or with their companions and associates in the work of the Gospel. Whether they were or were not subjected to the laying on of human hands, they were really invested with their sacred office, not by their bishops, not by their churches, but by Him who had already selected them for the work, and from whom alone the spirit of prophecy could ever emanate. When ~~the~~ one hundred and twenty persons, who were gathered together on the day of Pentecost, were all filled with the Holy Ghost, they spake with tongues and prophesied. These persons were appointed to the office of the ministry, and invested with its faculties, by an authority and power which precluded all interference, and which demanded nothing at the hands of the rulers of the church, but submission and praise. ‘Unto every one of us,’ says St.

Paul to the Ephesians, 'is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ. Wherefore he saith, when he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men And he gave some, apóstles ; and some, prophets ; and some, evangelists ; and some, pastors and teachers ; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.' Eph. iv. 7—12."

Gurney.

No. 2.

(WESLEY.)

The practice of lay-preaching, which had at first been vehemently opposed by the Wesleys, afterwards became a part of their system.

Southey's Life of Wesley.

No. 3.

(DUNKERS.)

Like the Methodists and Quakers, the Dunkers allow any individual among them to preach who may think himself inspired.

Twice every day and night they are called from their cells to attend divine service ; and even the dean or prior himself is said to go to church regularly at midnight. This sect was founded about 1724, by Conrad Peysel, a German.

See the Letters of Cospipini, p. 70, and Adam's Religious World.

No. 4.

(UNITARIANISM.)

" God the Father."

" Here again you see how Jesus Christ is distinguished from God, to whom he was subordinate,

and by whose power, and not his own, he was raised from the dead."

Priestley.

GALATIANS i. 6.

"I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ, into another Gospel."

No. 1.

(NAZARENES AND EBIONITES.)

Mr. Maclean conjectures that St. Paul here alludes to the Nazarenes and Ebionites, who made use of a gospel, or history of Christ, different from that which is received among us, and concerning which there have been many disputes among the learned.

Dr. Mosheim refers his readers for an account of this gospel, to Fabricius, in his *Codex Apocryph. Nov. Test.* tom. i. p. 355, and to a work of his own, entitled, *Vindiciæ contra Tolandi Nazarenorum*, p. 112.

See also Jones's Method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament.

The Nazarenes and Ebionites were abhorred by the Brethren of the Circumcision for their attachment to Christianity, and despised by the Christians for their prejudices in favour of the Mosaic Law.

Traces of this sect appeared so late as the fourth century. They were joined by the Elcesaites, an absurd sect, which grafted many opinions derived from the oriental philosophy on this mixture of Judaism and Christianity.

Some writers have supposed that there was a great difference between the doctrines of the Nazarenes and Ebionites, but Mr. Jones looked upon these two sects as differing very little from one another.

See his New and Full Method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament, vol. i. p. 385.

Origen notices two sorts of Ebionites, who differed in their ideas respecting the birth of Christ.

See Origen cont. Cels. Epiph. Hær. 20, Iræn. l. i. c. 20.

No. 2.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ I wonder that ye are so soon transferring yourselves from Christ, who called you with favour,” &c.—Wakefield’s Translation.

GALATIANS i. 14.

“ The Jews’ religion.”

No. 1.

(THE TALMUD.)

The Talmud was published at the close of the fifth century, or beginning of the sixth. This celebrated piece of Jewish literature, containing, as the Rabbins, assert the oral laws which God delivered to Moses, consists of two parts, each of which is divided into several books. The first part, Mishna, contains the text, the second is a kind of commentary upon that text, which is styled Gemara. This oral law, or tradition of the Jews, was collected after the destruction of the temple, in the year 150, by rabbi Judah, and is preferred by that people even

to the Scriptures. They suppose it was orally delivered by Moses to Israel, and unlawful to be written. When Jerusalem, however, was destroyed, they were constrained to write in order to preserve it; but wrote it in such a way that it could be understood by none but themselves. The Mishna and Gemara complete the two Talmuds; the first, that of Jerusalem, A. D. 230, the second, that of Babylon, five hundred years after Christ. The Talmuds, however intended, confirm in reality the history of Jesus Christ. The existence and actions of a person of that name are recorded in that of Babylon; and many texts relative to the Messiah are confirmed and explained by these books.

Basnage, Hist. des Juifs.

Many parts of the Talmud have been translated and rendered intelligible. The Mishna Terah of Maimonides contains the substance of the Mishna and Gemara, and may be understood with great ease.

See also Clavis Talmudica, Cock's Excerpta, and the works of Ludovicus Compeigne De Veil.

NO. 2. (THE THIRTEEN ARTICLES OF THE JEWISH RELIGION.)

Master. What are those things which the prophets have declared to be believed by us?

Scholar. Truly there are very many; but there are thirteen articles, which it is necessary that every man should believe, that is joined in communion with the Israelites. Moreover, it is necessary, that his belief of these articles be known and manifest to all men; and whosoever shall deprave but one of

them, he is declared to have deserted the synagogue, and to have renounced his religion, neither shall he be any more an Israelite.

M. Recite these thirteen articles; these foundations of pure religion; show plainly what they are.

S. This is the first; That we believe that there is a God, the first efficient cause and the ultimate end of all things; that all things, high and low, were created, and are continually sustained by him; that all things have received their being at his pleasure alone, and at his pleasure alone they perish; and that the divine essence is not diminished by their destruction, nor in the least altered, since its fullness and perfection is of itself alone, neither has he need of any other being: for God is light, power, and eternal life; dominion and empire belong to him alone, because he alone truly is, and enjoys real honour and majesty.

Another is this; that this God who made all things in heaven above, and in earth beneath, is one, simple, or uncompounded, so that nothing can be found within, nor without * any world, which is simple or uncompounded, in like manner as God hath the attribute of simplicity; this is that which we find written in Deut. vi. 4, "*Hear, O Israel! the Lord our God is one Lord.*"

The third fundamental article is, That God being one whose essence admits of no kind of multiplicity or composition, is neither a body, nor can be included within any body. Agreeable to this, is that saying

* That there were many worlds created by God, is an assertion common amongst the Jewish writers, which our author here lays down as a thing not to be doubted.—*Annotante Ludovico de Compeigne De Veil.*

which we find written, (Deut. iv. 15,) “ *Ye saw no manner of similitude.*”

The fourth is, That nothing could be before this God, simple, and incorporeal; but that he is the first and the last: as it is written, (Isaiah xliv. 6,) “ *I am the first, and I am the last, and besides me there is no God;*” which the great prophet thus expounds, (Deut. xxxiii. 27,) “ *The eternal God is thy refuge;*” that is to say, the place of refuge, in which the Israelites should acquiesce, and repose all their hopes, and all their possessions, is the eternal God, whom nothing may be compared or likened unto. Hence the same prophet, presently after, pours forth these words, “ *Happy art thou; O Israel! who is like unto thee, O people, saved by the Lord, the shield of thy help!*”

The fifth is, That to the eternal God, the only Creator of all things, to him alone is due worship and veneration; and to none besides him, because all things were created, and he is the Creator. That it is not lawful to pray for any thing, to any created nature, but we must still implore his aid, who has the sovereign power and dominion over all things, without exception. Whosoever honours as a God, either by sacrifices or any sacred rites, or by prayers and supplications, any king, or angel, or any power, whether celestial, or terrestrial, that he shall be accursed and given up to the most horrid torments.

The sixth, That the infinitely good and great God, of his singular benignity and good will, has chosen out of mankind sometimes one, sometimes many fit persons, as it pleased him; them he inspired with the knowledge of his mind, discovering unto them things to come, that by them the desires and actions

of other men might be directed to true godliness and honesty.

The seventh, That Moses did far excel in the gift of prophecy, all the prophets in all ages; that all the prophets that went before him, even the patriarchs themselves, and those that lived near the same time, were inferior to Moses in the excellency of prophecy; that he it was, whom the God of Jacob esteemed a fit person, by whom he would give a just law to the Israelites, to cherish and refresh their souls. Moreover, that Moses arrived to that degree of the knowledge of God, which no other man could ever approach unto.

M. Dost thou know how many ways the prophecy of Moses differs from the visions of the other prophets?

S. In four respects. First, That God spake not to any other prophet, but by an angel, or messenger separate from a body; and he afforded his presence to Moses, when he made known his mind unto him, as we find it written, (Numb. xii. 8.) “ *With him will I speak mouth to mouth.*” Secondly, that the spirit of prophecy did take hold of every other prophet in visions by night, or by day, whilst he was in a kind of slumber, that all his senses were, in a manner, stupified, which indeed those words of scripture do plainly declare, (ver. 6,) “ *I, the Lord, will make myself known unto him in a dream.*” But of Moses we find it written, (ver. 7,) “ *My servant Moses is not so: with him will I speak mouth to mouth.*” Thirdly, that at the breathing of the divine spirit, the strength of the other prophets failed them, and their senses were benumbed with horror; but Moses talked with God, as one man is wont to do with another, without any trembling or sudden decay of strength. Lastly,

that prophetic visions were not given to other interpreters of the divine will, at what time soever they were pleased to receive them; but when God, according to his secret will, was pleased to give them, and when they were duly prepared for them; but Moses was always prepared: and when he would, he was inspired with the divine wisdom, which we may clearly understand by that place of Scripture (Numb. ix. 8,) “*Stand still, and I will hear what the Lord will command concerning you.*”

M. I hear what thou sayest, and do fully approve it. Now I would have thee return to the explication of the other fundamental points of the law.

S. The eighth is, That all the law, from the first words, “*In the beginning,*” to the last, “*In the sight of all Israel,*” was written by Moses, as God had dictated it unto him; and that there is no distinction to be made betwixt these words, (Exod. xx. 2,) “*I am the Lord thy God;*” and those (Gen. xxxvi.) “*And Timna was concubine,*” or any other of the like kind. That the law is every way like itself; that every verse, and every single word is equally the word of God.

The ninth, That nothing must be added to, nor diminished from the Law of Moses; no, not so much as one word or letter, because it is expressly written, (Deut. xii. 32,) “*Thou shalt not add thereto nor diminish from it.*” For herein consists the perfection of any thing, that nought can be added to it, nor taken from it; but the law is absolutely perfect, which the royal prophet declares in express terms, (Ps. ix. 8,) “*The law of the Lord is perfect;* wherefore it does not admit of any addition or diminution.

The Tenth, That the infinitely good and great God doth behold the actions of all men, and his eyes

are always upon them, which this divine oracle doth expressly declare, (Jer. xxxii. 19.) “ *Great in counsel and mighty in work, for thine eyes are open upon all the ways of the sons of men.*” And that other text of Scripture, (Amos iv. 13.) “ *And declareth unto man what is his thought.*” For if he knew the thoughts of man, how much more evident is it, that he knows his actions?

The Eleventh, That God deals with every man according to that kind of life which he leads here upon earth: to those who keep his commandments, he gives great rewards; and inflicts great punishments on those that disobey him; sometimes in this world, sometimes in that which is to come, and sometimes in both; according to their several works, whether good or evil; but that the chief rewards, and the sharpest punishments, are deferred till they come to the other world.

The Twelfth is, That the Almighty God will send a Messiah to redeem his people; and that though you should meet with delays, nevertheless expect him. This Messiah shall be of the offspring of David, a branch of the root of Jesse the Bethlemite: he shall establish justice on earth, and judge many nations; righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins; he shall see his seed, and prolong his days over his kingdom; and there will be no other difference between the present state of the world, and what it shall be at the time of the Messias’ coming; but that the kingdom, as it was originally, shall return to the people of Israel; and they shall inhabit their own land, build their temple and offer sacrifices, as they did in their primitive station: the Priests shall attend their service, and the Levites glorify God in their hymns: the ten tribes carried

into captivity by the king of Assyria, and not since known or heard of, shall again be discovered and joined to the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, as you have it in Ezek. xxxiii. 16. *“ Moreover, thou son of man, take thee one stick, and write upon it, for Judah, and for the children of Israel his companions,”* &c. *“ Likewise, that all the nations of the earth shall come to Jerusalem yearly, to worship God.”* (Zec. xiv.) *“ That peace shall reign, and enmity cease, even amongst brute beasts.”* (Isa. ii. 11.)

The thirteenth is, That at a set time, known only to God, it will come to pass, that all the dead shall live again; that he who does not believe this, has no communion in religion with the Jews; for we have it thus written in the prophet, (Isa. xxvi. 19.) *“ Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they rise. Awake and sing ye that dwell in the dust.”* (Dan. xii. 2.) *“ And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake.”* But they are righteous men who shall be judged fit for the enjoyment of this so great and desirable good. I pray God we may be of their number, that God may give unto us eternal life, that we may be raised from the dead, and live in his sight.

See the Jew's Catechism, containing the Thirteen Articles of the Jewish Religion.



GALATIANS ii. 20.

“ Faith in the Son of God.”

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ i. e. In other words, Faith in the resurrection of Jesus, by which he was declared to be the Son of

God, Rom. i. 4. Righteous men are called sons of God, as they are to be raised to an immortal life, Luke xx. 36. And Christ is called the First-born, as having been first raised to immortality, Col. i. 18."

Belsham.

GALATIANS iii. 27.

"Baptized into Christ," &c.

No. 1. (QUAKERS.)

(See Notes on Matt. xxviii. 19, and Matt. iii. 11.)

"Have put on Christ."

No. 2. (UNITARIANISM.)

"This is a very bold, not to say a very harsh figure; but it is a very familiar one to the mind of the Apostle, and very necessary to be kept in view by all who are desirous thoroughly to understand his writings. All who by baptism have made a public profession of faith in the Gospel, have 'put on Christ,' so that as Mr. Locke justly explains the phrase, 'To God now looking upon them there appears nothing but Christ; they are, as it were, covered all over with him as a man is with his clothes he has put on; and hence he says, in the next verse, they are all one in Christ Jesus, as if they were but that one person.' The Apostle here, and in many other passages of his writings, considers the great body of believers as constituting one mystical person, of which Christ is the head. It is a favorite comparison with him to which he often alludes, and upon which he loves to dilate. See

Rom. xii. 4, 5; 1 Cor. xii. 27.; Eph. i. 23. v. 20. 31. It may, however, be proper to observe, that this symbolical and highly figurative mode of expression, gives no countenance to the modern imputed righteousness of Christ in order to justification; a notion than which nothing can be more foreign to the Apostle's mind or more inconsistent with reason and with Christianity, and which, indeed, never occurred to any one's imagination till many centuries after the mission and ministry of the Apostles had been concluded."

Belsham.



GALATIANS iii. 28.

"Ye are all one person in Christ Jesus."—Belsham's Translation.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"All believers make one person; and that person is the true and sole offspring of Abraham, to whom the promise was made, which the law, delivered long afterwards, could not disannul; a promise, which never has been repealed, and which, without the consent of the promisee, could not, in equity, be made void. Under the dispensation of the Gospel, (as Dr. Chandler expounds the text) there is no distinction of nation, or condition, or sex. Jews and Gentiles, bond and free, male and female, are all considered as one person in Christ. It may be observed here, that the Apostle expressly speaks of all believers as constituting one person; but no one is so weak as to understand this declaration in a literal sense. How unreasonable then is it to interpret a similar phraseology literally, when applied to Jesus

and his heavenly Father. See John x. 30. The union of Jesus with the Father, is the same as the union of all his disciples with him, with God, and with each other; a union not of nature, but of will and purpose; a mutual co-operation in promoting the cause of truth and virtue. See John xvii. 21, 22."

Belsham.

GALATIANS iv. 5.

"*Adoption of sons.*"

(FELIX OF URGEL.)

Towards the close of the eighth century, the following question occasioned considerable disturbance in Spain.

"Felix, Bishop of Urgel, in Catalonia, was consulted by Elipand, the Archbishop of Toledo, concerning the sense in which Jesus Christ was to be called the Son of God, and whether, as a man, he ought to be considered as the *adopted* or *natural* Son of the Father.

"Felix replied, that Jesus Christ, according to his human nature, could only be considered as the Son of God by *adoption* and a nominal Son; in the same sense that men are called in Scripture, 'Children of God.'

"The title of Son of God, he maintained, was only used by way of expressing in a particular manner the choice that God had made of Jesus Christ.

"He referred to Acts x. 38, and 2 Cor. v. 19, and argued, that St. Peter says, 'Christ performed miracles, because God was with him.' And St. Paul says, 'that God was in Christ reconciling the world

unto himself;' but he added, they do not affirm that Jesus Christ was God."

Alcuin, l. 1, 2, 3. cont. Felicem.

The followers of Felix were called Adoptians.

*See Histoire Litteraire de la Ville de Lyon, tom. ii. p. 70. and
Histoire Litteraire de la France, tom. iv. p. 434.*

GALATIANS iv. 9, 10, 11.

"Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years," &c.

No. 1. (PURITANS.)

The Puritans held the observation of festivals to be unlawful.

See Neal.

The Directory appointed, that Saints' days should be no longer observed; the following Christmas-day (1644) falling on a fast-day, the Parliament published an order, from which the following is an extract.

"That this day in particular is to be kept with the more solemn humiliation, because we may call to remembrance our sins and the sins of our forefathers, who have turned this feast, pretending the memory of Christ, into an extreme forgetfulness of him, by giving liberty to carnal and sensual delights, being contrary to the life which Christ led here on earth, and to the spiritual life of Christ in our souls, for the sanctifying and saving whereof Christ was pleased both to take a human life, and to lay it down again."

No. 2.

(QUAKERS.)

From these passages, and Rom. xiv. 5, 6, the Quakers think themselves justified in their disuse of the religious observance of days and times.

They, however, set apart one day out of the seven for religious services and cessation from business; though they do not consider the *first*, or any day of the week, as possessing a superior degree of holiness.

No. 3.

(GREEK CHURCH.)

The Greeks observe a great number of holydays and days of abstinence; and keep four fasts in the year more solemn than the rest, of which that of Lent is the chief. It is even said, there is not a day in the year, which, in their church, is not either a fast or a festival; and that the several books, containing the church service for all the days in the year, amount to more than twenty volumes folio, besides one large volume called the Regulation, which contains the direction how the rest are to be used.

They have twenty-two fixed and immoveable feasts, besides those of the Church of England. Their other festivals are moveable, and depend upon Easter; in assigning which, they make use of the old paschal or lunar cycle, as established by the first general council of Nice.

According to the canon of the Greek Church, Sunday is dedicated to the resurrection; Monday to the Angels; Tuesday to St. John the Baptist; Wednesday to the Virgin Mary and the Cross; Thursday to the Apostles; Friday to the passion of

Christ; and Saturday to the Saints and Martyrs. For these days there are particular hymns and services, in two volumes folio, entitled *Octoechos*, to which, and the *Menæon*, the *Common Service*, a book which contains services common to all saints, martyrs, bishops, &c. may be considered as a supplement.

(See Note on Matt. iv. 2.)

See Adam's Religious World.

No. 4.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“Why are ye turning back again to these weak and beggarly elements, to which ye are desirous of becoming slaves as before, and are observing days and months,” &c.—Wakefield's Translation.

The Arabic and Coptic versions properly connect the ninth and tenth verses.

Wakefield.

“How is it that ye observe days and months,” &c.

Belsham's Translation.

Dr. Chandler also reads it as an interrogation: Do ye observe days and months, &c. He adds, “by days he unquestionably means their weekly sabbaths and festivals; by months the festivals of the new moons; by times, their annual fasts and festivals; and by years, their sabbatical and jubilee years. Observe here, that it is because of their strict observation of these sabbatical seasons, and the great stress laid upon them, that the Apostle expresses his fears lest he had bestowed upon them labour in vain. He never gives the least hint that a Christian sabbath had been substituted in the room of the Jewish sabbath, which was to be observed with equal strictness: nor does he ever in any of

his epistles express his disapprobation of what is called sabbath-breaking, or warn his readers against it; this surely must have been a very great omission, if the Apostle had entertained the same ideas of the importance of sabbatizing which are inculcated by some modern Christians; who represent, what they are pleased to call the profanation of the Sabbath, as one of the greatest crimes, which deserves the cognizance even of the civil magistrate. The plain doctrine of the New Testament is, that all sabbatical institutions, without exception, are completely abolished; but that seasons of religious worship should be regularly observed; and in the primitive church, one of these seasons was the first day of the week: this was universally celebrated as a religious festival, in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ. See *Evanson and Priestley on the sabbatical observation of the Lord's day.*"

Belsham.

GALATIANS IV. 14.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"*As a messenger of God.*"—Wakefield and Belsham's Translation.

"It is needless to cite authorities to prove that the word *αγγελος* in its primary sense signifies a messenger, and not a celestial spirit. And it is sufficiently obvious, that this text gives no countenance to the popular doctrine that Jesus Christ is in his nature superior to the angels in heaven."

Belsham.

GALATIANS iv. 23.

(UNITARIANISM.)

There is so great boldness in the Apostle's allegorizing of the history of Sarah and Hagar, that it cannot be supposed that he really thought that it was originally intended to be applied as he does it. But he made choice of this portion of scripture, in order to express his own idea of the different states of the Judaizing Christians, and the Gentile converts; the former as in a state of bondage, the latter as free.

Priestley.

GALATIANS iv. 24.

(See Note on Rom. iv. 1.)

GALATIANS v. 1.

No. 1.

"Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free."

During the dispute about vestments to be worn by the clergy in the time of Queen Elizabeth, Dr. Guest, Bishop of Rochester, wrote to Secretary Cecil, and gave it as his opinion, with regard to ceremonies, that "they having been evil used, and once taken away, they ought not to be used again, because the Galatians were commanded to 'stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free.'"

See Neal's Hist. of the Puritans.

No. 2.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

With regard to the vestments in which the Priest says mass, (it is observed, in the "Garden of the Soul," the most popular prayer-book of the English Roman Catholics,) that as the mass represents the passion of *Christ*, and the priest there officiates in *his* person, so these vestments in which he officiates, represent those with which Christ was ignominiously clothed at the time of his passion. Thus the *Amice* represents the cloth or rag with which the Jews muffled our Saviour's face, when at every blow they bid him prophesy who it was that struck him. St. Luke xxii. 64. The *alb* represents the white garment with which he was vested by Herod. The *girdle*, *maniple*, and *stole*, represent the cords and bands with which he was bound in the different stages of his passion. The *chasuble*, or outward vestment, represents the purple garment, with which he was clothed as a mock king; upon the back of which there is a cross, to represent that which Christ bore on his sacred shoulders. Lastly, the Priest's *tonsure* or crown is to represent the crown of thorns which our Saviour wore.

Moreover, as in the old law, the Priests that were wont to officiate in the sacred functions, had, by the appointment of God, *vestments* assigned for that purpose; as well for the greater decency and solemnity of the divine worship, as to signify and represent the virtues which God required of his ministers; so it was proper, that in the church of the *New Testament*, Christ's ministers should, in their sacred functions, be distinguished in like manner, from the laity, by their sacred vestments; which might also represent the virtues which God requires in them;

thus the *amice*, which is first put upon the head, represents divine *hope*, which the Apostle calls the *helmet of salvation*; the *alb*, *innocence of life*; the *girdle* (with which the loins are begirt) *purity* and *chastity*; the *maniple* (which is put on the left arm) *patient suffering* of the labours of this mortal life; the *stole*, the sweet *yoke of Christ*, to be borne in this life, in order to a happy immortality; in fine, the *chasuble*, which is uppermost, and covers all the rest, represents the *virtue of charity*.

In these vestments, the church makes use of five colours, viz. the white on the feasts of our Lord, of the Blessed Virgin, of the Angels, and of the Saints that were not martyrs; the *red*, on the feasts of Pentecost, of the finding and exaltation of the cross, and of the Apostles and Martyrs; the *purple*, which is the penitential color, in the penitential times of Advent and Lent, and upon Vigils and Ember Days; the *green* on most of the Sundays and Ferias throughout the year; and the black on Good-Friday, and in the masses for the dead.

See “*the Garden of the Soul, or Manual of Spiritual Exercises and Instructions for the Roman Catholics.*”

GALATIANS v. 6.

“*For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love.*”

(QUAKERS.)

The Quakers, who deny that baptism was appointed by Christ in substitution of circumcision, contend, that the substitutes for it mentioned by the Apostles are only “*faith which worketh by love, and a new creature.*” Gal. vi. 15.

GALATIANS vi. 8.

"He that soweth to his flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption."

No. 1.

(TATIAN.)

Tatian condemned marriage as vehemently, as adultery, and supported his opinion by these words of St. Paul.

Tatian lived in the second century, and was a disciple of Justin Martyr. Regarding matter as the source of all evil, he contended, that the body ought to be severely mortified; and urged his disciples, who were called Encratites, Apoctatites, and Hydro-pæraſtes, (see Note on Matt. xxvi. 26.) to abstain from wine and animal food.

Epiph. Aug. de Hær. Cyprian Ep. 63.

No. 2.

(EUSTATHIUS.)

The followers of Eustathius, who lived in the fourth century, contended strongly for the exercise of the greatest austerities; and not only prohibited the enjoyments of wine, flesh, and the connubial state, but prescribed immediate divorce to all who had already entered into a married life.

Many women, seduced by the discourses of Eustathius, in which he inculcated the impossibility of salvation to those living in a married state, are said to have separated themselves from their husbands in consequence.

Epiph. Hær. 40. Socrat. l. ii. c. 23. Sozom. l. iii. c. 3. Basil ep. 74 et 82. Nicephore, l. ix. c. 16.

which Christ shed on the cross did not belong to his divine nature, and so was not the object of divine and immediate worship. The Dominicans furiously opposed this, and called him before the Inquisition, which condemned him of heresy. After several ineffectual attempts to suppress this debate, Pius, in 1464, thought proper to silence both parties, declaring, that both might lawfully hold their respective opinions, till the vicar of Christ should deliberately consider and determine the point, which it seems has never yet happened."

Brown's History, &c.

No. 2. (UNITARIANISM.)

"The manner of speaking that some have allowed themselves, from this representation of Christ's death by his blood, viz. that a drop of Christ's blood was sufficient for the redemption of the whole world, is a very crude and unjustifiable expression, that hath nothing in reason or Scripture to support it; for the great stress which Scripture lays, is constantly upon the death of Christ, and not upon any shedding of his blood, which implies less than his actually dying."

Belsham.

EPHESIANS i. 13.

"Ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit."

(WESLEY.)

"The πληροφωρία πιστεως, the seal of the Spirit, the love of God shed abroad in my heart, and pro-

ducing joy in the Holy Ghost, joy which no man taketh away, joy unspeakable, and full of glory; this witness of the Spirit I have not," said Wesley, "but I patiently wait for it. I know many who have already received it, more than one or two in the very hour we were praying for it. And having seen and spoken with a cloud of witnesses abroad, as well as in my own country, I cannot doubt but that believers who wait and pray for it, will find these Scriptures fulfilled in themselves. My hope is that they will be fulfilled in me."

This full assurance, or plerophory of faith, as it is termed by Wesley, was defined to him by Gradin, a Swede.

"I had," said the Swede, "from our Lord, what I asked of him, the πληροφωρία πιστεως, fulness of faith, which is repose in the blood of Christ; a firm confidence in God, and persuasion of his favour, with a deliverance from every fleshly desire, and a cessation of all, even inward sins. In a word, my heart, which before was agitated like a troubled sea, was in perfect quietness, like a sea that is serene and calm."

"This," says Wesley, "was the first account I ever heard from any living man of what I had before learned myself from the oracles of God, and had been praying for, with the little company of my friends, and expecting for several years."

Wesley.

GALATIANS vi. 15.

(QUAKERS.)

(See Note on Gal. v. 6.)

GALATIANS vi. 17.

“ I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus.”

No. 1.

(ST. FRANCIS.)

It was asserted by the Franciscan Monks, that Christ had miraculously transferred his wounds to St. Francis*, the founder of their order; and the belief of this absurdity was enjoined by the Roman Pontiffs.

See Wadding's Annales Minorum, tom. viii.

No. 2.

The Jesuit Diusse informs us, that in the mountains which separate Persia from India, there lives a sect of Christians, who imprint the sign of the cross on their bodies with a red-hot iron.

Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuses des Missions Etrangères,
tom. i. p. 63.

* That St. Francis had upon his body the marks or impressions of the five great wounds of Christ, is not to be doubted; since this is a fact proved by a great number of unexceptionable witnesses. It was customary, in these times, for such as were willing to be thought more pious than others, to imprint upon their bodies marks of this kind; that having thus continually before them a lively representation of the death of Christ, they might preserve a becoming sense of it on their minds. The words of St. Paul, Gal. vi. 17, were sufficient to confirm in this delusion an ignorant and superstitious age, in which the Scriptures were neither studied nor understood.

EPHESIANS.

EPHESIANS i. 2.

"From God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"You see how the Apostle constantly distinguishes God from Christ. Indeed there is no passage in the New Testament in which Christ is so much as called God, though in an inferior sense."

Priestley.

EPHESIANS i. 7.

"His blood."

No. 1.

(DOMINICANS AND FRANCISCANS.)

"About 1351 the Dominicans and Franciscans had begun a warm dispute, what kind of worship is due to our Saviour's blood, whether the more divine latreia, or the inferior duleia. It was renewed in 1462. James of Marchia, a celebrated Franciscan, in one of his sermons, maintained, that the blood

EPHESIANS i. 17.

"That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"What plainer proof can there be, that Jesus Christ is the creature of God, and not his equal? Dr. Chandler observes, 'that it can never in any sense be said of Christ, that he is God of the eternal Father.' 'Here it is evident,' says Dr. Priestley, 'that all the illumination the Apostle prayed for was to come from God the Father, who is here called the God of our Lord Jesus Christ; the same, no doubt, who was the author of his being, whom he reverently worshipped, and whom he taught his disciples to worship: so far was he from teaching the worship of himself.' "

Belsham.

EPHESIANS i. 20.

"And set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places."

(UNITARIANISM.)

In the figurative language of the Apostle, all who enjoy the light of divine revelation, whether Jews or Christians, are said to dwell in heaven. See chap. ii. 6. And the unbelieving world are spoken of as inhabitants of earth. But the Jewish notion of heaven, borrowed not from divine revelation, which is silent upon the subject, but from the oriental philosophy, which they appear to have imbibed in the Babylonian captivity, (see Mr. Lindsey's valuable

observations in the Sequel to his Apology, p. 456, and seq.) represented the celestial world as peopled by myriads of beings who were of different ranks and orders; angels, archangels, principalities, powers, &c. Agreeably to this figurative representation, Jesus Christ is said, after his resurrection, to be seated at the right hand of God in heaven, i. e. to be advanced to the highest dignity in the Christian dispensation; above all principality, power, and might, &c. that is, above all the officers and ministers of the Jewish or Christian dispensation, expressed by the well-known phraseology of the present age and the age to come. This interpretation makes the Apostle's discourse consistent, intelligible, and pertinent; but it gives no countenance either to the commonly received opinion of the existence of a celestial hierarchy, or the popular doctrine of the superiority of Christ to angels, and other supposed celestial spirits. "The Gospel dispensation," says Mr. Lindsey, p. 464, "is represented under the idea of a new regulation of these heavenly communities, in which Christ is placed at the head of all."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

EPHESIANS i. 21.

"All principality," &c.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"The Jewish dispensation having been represented as 'heavenly places,' the superiority of Christ to the officers of that dispensation is naturally described as an exaltation above the supposed ranks

and orders of beings in those heavenly places : but as Christ is also superior to all the officers of his church, this superiority is represented as an exaltation above such supposed orders of beings in the world or age to come, that is the Christian dispensation, as well as in the present world or age, that is the dispensation of the Law. So that there is no reason to suppose that the Apostle had any intention to express or allude to the superiority of Christ above angels in heaven."

Belsham.

EPHESIANS i. 22.

" Head over all things."

(UNITARIANISM.)

" It is a fine figure by which Christ is here represented as the head, and his disciples the body, all being one and the same system ; he only having pre-eminence in point of honour, distinction, and usefulness. A similar idea is expressed by Christ being called our elder brother, implying, that he is one of the same species and family. Accordingly, when he is called an heir of God, his brethren are joint heirs with him. This doctrine is uniformly inculcated in the New Testament, and we ought to have our minds deeply impressed with it, and fully to understand its value, in opposition to that system, however prevalent, which makes Christ a being of equal rank with God his Father, and thus, in fact, makes three Gods or objects of religious worship."

Priestley.

EPHESIANS ii. 2.

"Prince of the power of the air."
(UNITARIANISM.)

"There is no reason to suppose, either with Dr. Harwood, that Jupiter is the person alluded to by the Apostle, (see Harwood's Introd. to the New Test.) or with many, that the devil is a real being, who resides in the air, and who has power to govern the changes of the atmosphere. This most improbable doctrine, which makes a malignant spirit a colleague with the Deity in the government of the universe, receives no countenance from the writings of Paul, who only alludes to a mythology already subsisting."

Belsham.

"As Jews and Christians residing (figuratively) in heaven, are represented as constituting a polity under the government of angels, principalities, and powers, &c. so the unevangelized world are a polity under the government of a fictitious personage called Satan, the ruler of the air, &c. and his angels. This whole imagery is borrowed from the oriental philosophy, and is not to be taken in a literal sense. See Mr. Lindsey."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

EPHESIANS ii. 8.

"Grace."

No. 1.

(PELAGIUS.)

About the commencement of the fifth century, Pelagius a Briton, and Cœlestius, a native of Ire-

land, broached opinions which have occasioned much controversy in after times.

They contended, with regard to grace, that the common doctrines of man's original corruption, and the absolute necessity of divine grace to enlighten and purify the heart, tended to discourage holiness, and lull men asleep in presumptuous and fatal security; that *external grace*, in the calls of the Gospel, or cause of Providence, is necessary for our excitement to the study of virtue, but the internal assistance of the Holy Ghost quite needless; that, in short, free agency would be annihilated, if grace were necessary. St. Augustine taught, on the contrary, that, even before the Fall, it was impossible Adam could have continued in his original uprightness without grace.

See Pelag. apud Aug. de nat. et grat.

No. 2.

(GODESCHALCUS.)

In the ninth century, Godeschalcus expressed sentiments, respecting predestination and grace, similar to those which were afterwards entertained by Calvin.

See Hist. Littéraire de la France, Usseii Histoire Godeschalci.

No. 3.

(CALVIN.)

According to Calvin, "those whom God has called and sanctified by his Spirit shall never finally fall from a state of grace."

See Calvin's Institutions, Assembly's Confession of Faith, &c.

No. 4.

(DOMINICANS, JESUITS, JANSENISTS.)

It is impossible, in a work of this size, to enter into the disputes between the Dominicans* and Jesuits†, concerning grace, predestination, human

* The Dominicans, called in some places Jacobins, and in others, Predicants, or Preaching Friars, take their name from their founder, Dominic de Gusman, a Spanish gentleman, born in 1170, at Calaroga, in Old Castile. He was first canon and archdeacon of Osuna, and afterwards preached with great zeal and vehemence against the Albigenses in Languedoc, where he laid the first foundation of his order. It was approved of in 1215 by Innocent III., and confirmed in 1216 by a bull of Honorius III., under the title of St. Augustin, to which Dominic added several austere precepts and observances, obliging the brethren to take a vow of absolute poverty, and to abandon entirely all their revenues and possessions; and also the title of Preaching Friars, because public instruction was the main end of their institution.

† The Society of Jesus, whose members are called Jesuits, was founded by Ignatius Loyola, who was born at the castle of Loyola, in Biscay, 1491. The plan which this fanatic formed of its constitution and laws was suggested, as he gave out, and as his followers still teach, by the immediate inspiration of heaven. But notwithstanding this high pretension, his design met at first with violent opposition. The pope, to whom Loyola had applied for the sanction of his authority, to confirm the institution, referred his petition to a committee of cardinals. They represented the establishment to be unnecessary as well as dangerous, and Paul refused to grant his approbation of it. At last Loyola removed all his scruples by an offer which it was impossible for any pope to resist. He proposed, that besides the three vows of poverty, of chastity, and of monastic obedience, which are common to all the orders of regulars, the members of his society should take a fourth vow of obedience to the pope, binding themselves to go whithersoever he should command for the service of religion, and without requiring any thing from the holy see for their support. At a time when the papal authority had received such a shock by the revolt of so many nations from the Romish church; at a time when every part of the popish system was attacked with so much violence and success, the acquisition of a body of men,

liberty, and original sin ; suffice it to say, that the Dominicans followed the sentiments of Thomas Aquin-

thus peculiarly devoted to the see of Rome, and whom it might set in opposition to all its enemies, was an object of the highest consequence. Paul instantly perceived this, confirmed the institution of the Jesuits by his bull, granted the most ample privileges to the members of the society, and appointed Loyola to be first general of the order. The event has fully justified Paul's discernment, in expecting such beneficial consequences to the see of Rome from this institution. In less than half a century the society obtained establishments in every country that adhered to the Roman Catholic church : its power and wealth increased amazingly ; the number of its members became great ; their character, as well as accomplishments, were still greater ; and the Jesuits were celebrated by the friends, and dreaded by the enemies of the Romish faith, as the most able and enterprising order in the church.

The constitution and laws of the society were perfected by Laynez and Aquaviva, the two generals who succeeded Loyola, men far superior to their master in abilities, and in the science of government. They framed that system of profound and artful policy which distinguishes the order. The large infusion of fanaticism, mingled with its regulation, should be imputed to Loyola its founder. Many circumstances concurred in giving a peculiarity of character to the order of Jesuits, and in forming the members of it not only to take greater part in the affairs of the world than any other body of monks, but to acquire superior influence in the conduct of them.

The primary object of almost all the monastic orders is to separate men from the world, and from any concern in its affairs. In the solitude and silence of the cloister, the monk is called to work out his own salvation by extraordinary acts of mortification and piety. He is dead to the world, and ought not to mingle in its transactions. He can be of no benefit to mankind, but by his example and by his prayers. On the contrary, the Jesuits are taught to consider themselves as formed for action. They are chosen soldiers, bound to exert themselves continually in the service of God, and of the pope his vicar on earth. Whatever tends to instruct the ignorant, whatever can be of use to reclaim or to oppose the enemies of the holy see, is their proper object. That they may have full leisure for their active service, they are totally exempted from those functions, the performance of which is the chief business of other monks.

nas concerning grace, &c. and that the opinions of the Jesuits bore a strong resemblance to those of the Pelagians.

For farther information on this subject, the reader is referred to “*Le Clerc, Memoires pour servir a l’Histoire des Controverses dans l’Eglise Romaine sur la Predestination et la Grace,*” in his *Bibliothèque Universelle et Historique*, tom. xiv. p. 235.

Jansenius, (born in the year 1585, at Accoy, in Holland, principal of the sect called from his name Jansenists) opposed to the doctrine of the Jesuits the sentiments of St. Augustine, and wrote a treatise on grace, which he intitled, “*Augustinus.*” This treatise was attacked by the Jesuits, who accused Jansenius of maintaining dangerous and heretical opinions; and afterwards, in 1642, obtained of pope Urban VIII. a formal condemnation of the treatise written by Jansenius; when the partisans of Jansenius gave out that this bull was spurious, and composed by a person entirely devoted to the Jesuits. After the death of Urban VIII. the affair of Jansenism began to be more warmly controverted, and gave birth to an infinite number of polemical writings concerning grace. And what occasioned some mirth, were the titles which each party gave to their writings; one writer published, “*The Torch of St. Augustine;*” another found “*Snuffers for St. Augus-*

They appear in no processions; they practice no rigorous austerities; they do not consume one half of their time in the repetition of tedious offices; but they are required to attend to all the transactions of the world, on account of the influence which these may have upon religion; they are directed to study the dispositions of persons in high rank, and to cultivate their friendship; and by the very constitution, as well as genius of the order, a spirit of action and intrigue is infused into all its members.

tine's Torch;" and father Veron formed "A Gag for the Jansenists," &c. In the year 1650, sixty-eight bishops of France subscribed a letter to pope Innocent X. to obtain an enquiry into and condemnation of the five following propositions, extracted from "Jansenius's Augustine:" 1. Some of God's commandments are impossible to be observed by the righteous, even though they endeavour with all their power to accomplish them. 2. In the state of corrupted nature, we are incapable of resisting inward grace. 3. Merit and demerit, in a state of corrupted nature, do not depend on a liberty which excludes necessity, but on a liberty which excludes constraint. 4. The Semipelagians admitted the necessity of an inward preventing grace for the performance of each particular act, even for the beginning of faith; but they were heretics in maintaining that this grace was of such a nature, that the will of man was able either to resist or obey it. It is Semipelagianism to say, that Jesus Christ died, or shed his blood, for all mankind in general.

In the year 1632, the pope appointed a congregation for examining into the dispute in relation to grace. In this congregation Jansenius was condemned; and the bull of condemnation, published in May, 1653, filled all the pulpits in Paris with violent outcries and alarms against the heresy of the Jansenists. In the year 1656, pope Alexander VII. issued out another bull, in which he condemned the five propositions of Jansenius. However, the Jansenists affirm, that these propositions are not to be found in this book; but that some of his enemies having caused them to be printed on a sheet, inserted them in the book, and thereby deceived the pope. At last Clement XI. put an end to the dispute, by

his constitution of the seventeenth of July, 1705; in which, after having united the constitution of his predecessors in relation to this affair, he declares, "That in order to pay a proper obedience to the papal constitutions concerning the present question, it is necessary to receive them with a respectful silence." The clergy of Paris, the same year, approved and accepted this bull, and none dared to oppose it.

This is the famous bull "Unigenitus," so called from its beginning with the words *Unigenitus Dei Filius*, &c. which has occasioned so much confusion in France.

The reader is referred to Bayle's *Dic. tom. ii. Art. Jansenius*, *Leydecker de vita et morte Jansenii*, *Dict. des livres Jansenistes*.

D'Avrigny gives the following summary of Jansenism. "Que depuis la chute d'Adam, le plaisir est l'unique ressort qui remue le cœur de l'homme; que ce plaisir est inévitable quand il vient, et invincible quand il est venu. Si ce plaisir est céleste, il porte à la vertu; s'il est terrestre, il détermine au vice, et la volonté se trouve nécessairement entraînée par celui des deux qui est actuellement le plus fort. Ces deux délectations, sont comme les deux bassins d'une balance; l'un ne peut monter sans que l'autre ne descende. Ainsi, l'homme fait invinciblement, quoique volontairement, le bien ou le mal, selon qu'il est dominé par la grâce ou la cupidité."

"That since the fall of Adam, pleasure is the only spring which moves the heart of man; that this pleasure is inevitable in its coming, and invincible when it is come. If this pleasure be celestial, it conducts to virtue; if terrestrial, it determines to vice; and the will is necessarily drawn along by that of the

two which is actually the most powerful. These two enticements are as the two scales of a balance ; the one cannot rise without the other falling. Thus man does inevitably, though voluntarily, good or evil, according as he is ruled by grace or desire."

" Here," said Avrigny, " is the basis of the work of Jansenius ; all the other parts, especially the five condemned propositions, which enclose as it were the quintessence of this work, are but consequences and corollaries."

D'Avrigny, mém Chronol. et Dogmat. t. ii. p. 6.

EPHESIANS ii. 9.

" Not of works."

(AMSDORF.)

Amsdorf was so far transported and infatuated by his excessive zeal for the doctrine of Luther, as to maintain, that *good works were an impediment to salvation*. Those who were of opinion that the will of man co-operated with the grace of God in working out salvation, were termed Synergists.

See Mosheim.

EPHESIANS ii. 13.

" By the blood of Christ."

(UNITARIANISM.)

" Qu ? How by the blood of Christ ? The Apostle immediately explains himself. The death of Christ

broke down the partition wall, and opened a way for the worshippers in the outer court to advance into the holy place."

Belsham.

EPHESIANS iii. 9.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"And to shew clearly unto all, what is the dispensation * of that mystery, which was hidden from the ages in God, who appointed all these things."—Wakefield's Translation.

* "The dispensation, ἡ οὐκονομία—this is the reading of all the ancient versions but the Arabic; which is true also of the omission of the words *δια Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*."

Wakefield.

"And to manifest clearly unto all that mysterious dispensation, which was concealed from the past ages in God, who hath created all these things."—Belsham's Translation.

"Hidden in God, who hath created all things."—Unitarian Version.

"The words '*by Jesus Christ*,' in the received text, and inclosed by the primate in brackets, are not to be found in the Alexandrine, Vatican, Ephrem, or Clermont manuscripts, nor in the Syriac, Coptic, Ethiopic, Italic or Vulgate versions, and are plainly an interpolation, perhaps a marginal gloss introduced into the text."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

nites *, from the famous Menno Simon, who lived in the sixteenth century.

* The modern Mennonites not only consider themselves as the descendants of the Waldenses, who were so grievously oppressed and persecuted by the despotic heads of the Roman Church, but asserted moreover, that they were the purest offspring of these respectable sufferers, being equally averse to all principles of rebellion on the one hand, and all suggestion of fanaticism on the other.—See Herm. Schyn. *Plenior Deductio Histor. Mennon.* cap. i. p. 2, as also a Dutch work entitled *Galenus Abrahamzon, Verdediging der Christenem, die Doopsgezinde genamd worden*, p. 29.

Their adversaries, on the contrary, represent them as the descendants of those turbulent and furious Anabaptists, who, in the sixteenth century, involved Germany, Holland, Switzerland, and more especially the province of Westphalia, in such scenes of blood, perplexity, and distress: and allege, that, terrified by the dreadful fate of their associates, and also influenced by the moderate counsel and wise injunctions of Menno, they abandoned the ferocity of their primitive enthusiasm, and were gradually brought to a better mind.

The Mennonites are subdivided into several sects; whereof the two principal are the Flandrians or Flemings, and the Waterlandians. The opinions that are held in common by the Mennonites, seem to be all derived from this fundamental principle,—that the kingdom which Christ established upon earth, is a visible church or community into which the holy and just alone are to be admitted, and which is consequently exempt from all those institutions and rules of discipline that have been invented by human wisdom for the correction and reformation of the wicked. This principle, indeed, was avowed by the ancient Mennonites; but it is now almost wholly renounced: nevertheless, from this ancient doctrine, many of the religious opinions that distinguish the Mennonites from all other Christian communities, seem to be derived. In consequence of this doctrine, they admit none to the sacrament of baptism, but persons that are come to the full use of their reason; they neither admit civil rulers into their communion, nor allow any of their members to perform the functions of magistracy; they deny the lawfulness of repelling force by force, and consider war in all its shapes as unchristian and unjust. They entertain the utmost aversion to the execution of justice, and more especially to capital punishments; and they also refuse to confirm their testimony by an oath. The particular sentiments that divided the more considerable societies of the Men-

In the seventeenth century, the English Anabaptists differed from their Protestant brethren about the subject and mode of baptism alone; confining the former to the grown Christians, and the latter to immersion or dipping. They were divided into generals and particulars* from their different sentiments upon the Arminian controversy. The latter, who were so called from their belief of the doctrines of particular election, redemption, &c. were strict Calvinists, who separated from the Independent congregation at Leyden, in the year 1638. Their confession was composed with a remarkable spirit of modesty and charity.

Baptists are sometimes denominated Antipædobaptists, from their refusing to baptize children.

See Mosheim, Neal, and Gregory.

Neal remarks in his History of the Puritans, “that there was not one professed Anabaptist in the as-

nonites, are the following: The rigid Mennonites, called the “Flemingians,” maintain, with various degrees of rigour, the opinions of their founder Menno as to the human nature of Christ, alleging, that it was produced in the womb of the Virgin by the creating power of the Holy Ghost; the obligation that binds us to wash the feet of strangers, in consequence of our Saviour’s command; the necessity of excommunicating and avoiding, as one would do the plague, not only avowed sinners, but also all those who depart, even in some light instances pertaining to dress, &c. from the simplicity of their ancestors; the contempt due to human learning, and other matters of less moment. However this austere system declines, and the rigid Mennonites are gradually approaching towards the opinions and discipline of the more moderate or Waterlandians.

* The particular Baptists separated from the Independent congregation about the year 1638, and set up for themselves under the pastoral care of Mr. Jesse; but having renounced their former baptism, they sent over one of their number, Mr. Blunt, to be dipped by one of the Dutch Anabaptists of Amsterdam, that he might be qualified to baptize his friends in England after the same manner.

sembly, (A.D. 1644.) but their sentiments began to spread fully without doors."

"Their teachers were, for the most part, illiterate, though Mr. Baxter says, 'He found many of them sober, godly, and zealous, not differing from their brethren but as to infant baptism.' These joining with the Independents in the point of discipline and toleration, made them the more considerable, and encouraged their opposition to the Presbyterians, who were for establishing their own discipline without regard to such as differed from them."

See Neal.

The Mennonites, in Pennsylvania, administer baptism to none but adults; but they do not baptize by *immersion*.

Their common method is this; the person to be baptized kneels, the minister holds his hands over him, into which the deacon pours water, and through which it runs on the crown of the kneeling person's head, after which follow imposition of hands and prayer.

Edwards's History of the American Baptists.

No. 5.

An injunction was given in the reign of Edward VI, that in the administration of baptism, a cross was to be made on the child's forehead and breast, and the devil was exorcised to go out, and enter no more into him. The child was to be dipt three times in the font, on the right and left side, and on the breast, if not weak. A white vestment was to be put upon it in token of innocence; and it was to be anointed on the head, with a short prayer for unction of the Holy Ghost.

No. 6. (PURITANS.)

In the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the Puritans protested strongly against the custom of using the sign of the cross in baptism.

See Neal's Hist. of the Puritans.

No. 7. (ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

Provided an infant is in danger of dying before a priest can be procured, any other person, whether man, woman, or child, may baptize it in the following manner :

Whilst pouring *common* water on the head or face of the infant, pronounce these words,

“ I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.”

See “ the Garden of the Soul, or Manual of Spiritual Exercises and Instructions for the Roman Catholics.”

No. 8. (GREEK CHURCH.)

The Greeks practise the trine immersion, or form of dipping the child thrice in water. Previously to baptism, the child, though not two months old, must be solemnly initiated into the church, as a catechumen, through the medium of its sponsors, when exorcism is used.

Formerly only one sponsor was required, but at present the number is not limited. It is not, however, unworthy of notice, that a godfather is not permitted to marry his god-daughter.

When the child is baptized, the priest proceeds immediately to anoint it with the holy chrism ; for this, though reckoned a distinct mystery, is inseparable from baptism. Previous to baptism, the child was anointed with oil, which was likewise used

in the consecration of the baptismal water ; but this chrism is a very different thing from it, and consists of various oils, and other precious ingredients, which in different proportions are all boiled together, and afterwards solemnly consecrated by a bishop, and only on Maunday Thursday, that is, Thursday in passion week ; and as the anointing with it is substituted in place of the apostolical rite of the laying on of hands, called Confirmation in the churches of Rome and England, and it is occasionally used for some other purposes, great quantities of it are of course prepared at once, and distributed among the different churches of each diocese. This anointing, the Greeks call “ the seal of the gift of the Holy Ghost ;” which words the priest repeats while he applies the chrism, or holy oil, to the forehead, eyes, nostrils, mouth, ears, breasts, hands, and feet of the child.

Immediately after, or some days after, as ordered, the child is again brought to the church ; when the priest, after praying for it, unties its girdle and linen clothes, and then taking a new sponge, moistened with clean water, he washes its face, breast, &c. saying, “ Thou hast been baptized, enlightened, anointed, sanctified, and washed, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, now and for ever, even unto ages of ages. Amen.”

The last ceremony appended to baptism, is that of the tonsure, or cutting the hair of the child’s head in the form of the cross ; when the priest offers up for it several prayers, all alluding to the rite to be performed, and then cuts its hair *crosswise*, saying, N. the servant of God, is shorn in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, &c.

See King’s Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church in Russia, and the Supplement to the Encyc. Brit. Art. Church.

Archbishop Plato observes, that the clergy of the Russian Greek Church do not rebaptize proselytes, as has been reported, from any communion of Christians, excepting those who are unsound in the doctrine of the Trinity; and that all others are admitted members of their church, on their submitting to the mystery of the holy chrism.

M. Duten's Œuvres Mêlées, part. ii. p. 170.

No. 9.

(SOCINIANS.)

Dr. Priestley informs us, that “the Socinians of the present day baptize children more from the influence of settled custom, and through a desire of avoiding all disturbance, than from any fixed persuasion that they are under an obligation to baptize them.”

History of the Corruptions of Christianity, vol. ii. p. 94.

No. 10.

(QUAKERS.)

According to the tenets of the Quakers, the “one baptism, which now remains necessary to the church of Christ, is that of the Spirit.”

(See Notes on Matt. iii. 11, and xxviii. 19.)

“We believe there is one baptism necessary to salvation, Eph. iv. 5. One Lord, one faith, one baptism. And this baptism is spiritual, of which John’s water was but a figure, John i. 31. ‘That he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore, am I come, baptizing with water,’ said John, 1 Pet. iii. 21. ‘The like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us: not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.’ This one spi-

ritual baptism into the name of Jesus Christ, is that which saves, the water being but a figure, that Christ might be manifest to Israel, who had divers baptisms imposed on them until the time of reformation, but Christ the substance being come, the shadows flee away."

*Declaration of our Faith who are called Quakers, printed
A.D. 1668.*

No. 11.

(DUNKERS.)

This modern sect, whose members are called Tunkers, and sometimes Dumplers, seems to have obtained the name of Dunkers *, from their baptizing their new converts by plunging. They are also called Tumblers, from the manner in which they perform baptism, which is, by putting the person, while kneeling, head first under the water, so as to resemble the motion of the body in the act of tumbling.

Hannah Adams' View.

EPHESIANS iv. 11. 13.

"He gave some Apostles, &c. until we all meet," &c.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

"Note here, that Christ has left in his church

* The Dunkers use the same form of government, and the same discipline as the English Baptists, except that every person is allowed to speak in the congregation, and their best speaker is usually ordained to be their minister. They have also deacons and deaconesses from among their ancient widows, who may all use their gifts, and exhort at stated times.—See the *Letters of Caspian*, p. 70.

a perpetual succession of orthodox pastors and teachers, to preserve the faithful in unity and truth."

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

EPHESIANS iv. 15.

"May grow up into him in all things which is the head."

(WESLEY.)

"This expression," said Wesley, "points out the exact analogy there is between natural and spiritual things. A child is born of a woman in a moment, or at least, in a very short time. Afterwards he gradually and slowly grows, till he attains the stature of a man. In like manner a person is born of God in a short time, if not in a moment; but it is by slow degrees that he afterwards grows up to the measure of the full stature of Christ. The same relation, therefore, which there is between our natural birth and our growth, there is also between our new birth and our sanctification. And sanctification, though in some degree the immediate fruit of justification, is a distinct gift of God, and of a totally different nature. The one implies what God does for us through his Son; the other what he works in us by his Spirit. Men are no more able of themselves to think one good thought, to speak one good word, or do one good work, after justification, than before they were justified. When the Lord speaks to our hearts the second time, 'be clean,' then only the evil root, the carnal mind is destroyed, and sin subsists no more. A deep conviction that there is yet in us a carnal mind, shows beyond all possibility of doubt, the absolute necessity of a farther change.

If there be no such second change, if there be no instantaneous deliverance after justification, if there be none but a gradual work of God, then we must be content, as well as we can, to remain full of sin till death; and if so, we must remain guilty till death, continually deserving punishment."

Wesley.

EPHESIANS iv. 27.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"*Nor give any room to the accuser.*"—Wakefield's Translation.

Erasmus, with the Syriac version, gives the sense, *ut ne detis locum calumniatori.*

"*Give no advantage to the slanderer.*"—Unitarian Version.

"*And give no advantage to the accuser.*"—Belsham's Translation.

EPHESIANS iv. 32.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"*Even as God by Christ hath freely forgiven you.*"

Belsham's Translation.

"God is nowhere said to forgive sin for the sake of Christ."

Priestley.

"*As God also through Christ.*"—Unitarian Version.

"Through Christ, i. e. not through the merits, but according to the authorised declarations of Christ."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

EPHESIANS v. 2.

"Offering and sacrifice."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"Some distinguish *προσφορά* as a peace-offering, and *θυσία* as a sin-offering. See Macnight and Dr. Bates' Harmony of Divine Attributes; 'but I cannot lay much stress,' observes Doddridge, 'upon this distinction;' neither, indeed, ought any stress to be laid upon the figurative representation of the death of Christ, as a sacrifice, as though it necessarily implied atonement, propitiation, or satisfaction to God for the sins of men."

Belsham.

EPHESIANS v. 20.

"In the name."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"i. e. Under the authority of Christ as instructed by him."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

EPHESIANS v. 32.

No. 1.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

"This is a great sacrament, but I speak in Christ and in the Church."—Roman Catholic Version.

The seven sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church are, "baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, extreme unction, ordination, and matrimony."

No. 2.

(GREEK AND RUSSIAN CHURCH.)

The Greeks * have seven sacraments, or as they term them, mysteries; which are defined to be ceremonies or acts appointed by God, in which God giveth or signifieth to us his grace. This number they have probably received from the Latin Church; they are, 1. Baptism. 2. The Chrism, or Baptismal Unction. 3. The Eucharist, or Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. 4. Confession. 5. Ordination. 6. Marriage. And, 7, the Euchelaion, or Mystery of the Holy Oil, with prayer.

See Smith, de Statu Hodierno Ecclesiæ Græcæ.

EPHESIANS vi. 11.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“Against the artifices of the slanderer.”—Belsham's Translation.

“The slanderer.—του διαβολου, the devil. So the public and most other versions, applying it to the supposed leader of evil spirits. Accuser. Wakefield. The insidious artifice of the false accuser. Harwood. That the Apostle is here cautioning his readers

* The Russian Church agrees almost in every point of doctrine with the Greek Church, subject to the Patriarch of Constantinople.

The Raskolniks, who have broken off from the Russian Church, are, in fact, a great many different sects, as different from each other as from the Established Church.

The Raskolniks assumed the name of Isbraniki, i. e. the multitude of the elect; or, according to others, Staroivertsi, i. e. believers in the ancient faith; but the name given them by their adversaries, and that by which they are generally known, is Raskolniki, i. e. Schismatics, or the seditious faction.—*See King, p. 439.*

against the artifices of the judaizing teachers, by which they endeavoured to corrupt the Christian doctrine by blending it with the ceremonies of the Mosaic ritual, is sufficiently evident from the context; and that these teachers were justly entitled to the name of διαβολοι, or slanderers, is notorious, both from Luke's History, and Paul's Epistles, especially those to the Galatians and Corinthians."

Belsham.

EPHESIANS vi. 12.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"For we combat not merely with the vices and prejudices of private individuals, but we have to conflict with all the confederate and united powers of grand and potent establishments, both civil and religious, which are supported by the sovereigns and rulers of this benighted age."—Harwood's Translation.

"For we not only have to wrestle against flesh and blood, but against the authority, against the powers, against the rulers of this dark age, against the wickedness of spiritual men in a heavenly dispensation."—Wakefield's Translation.

"Viz. against Jewish governors, who have a dispensation of religion from heaven, as well as against heathen magistrates under the darkness of superstition and idolatry."

Wakefield.

"Perhaps, however, we shall approximate more nearly to the true meaning of the Apostle, if by taking the words principalities and powers, &c. in the sense in which they are used, chap. i. 21, as meaning the Jewish hierarchy and zealots for the law in general; we should understand its correlative

blood and flesh, as expressing heathen idolaters and opposers of the Gospel, see Heb. xii. 4. The contrast then will be, not between wicked men and angels, according to the common opinion, nor between men in low degree and men in power, according to Dr. Chandler and Dr. Harwood, but between the power and prejudices of heathen idolaters, and those of Jewish rulers and zealots for the law; not excluding the judaizing Christians, who created so much uneasiness to the Apostle and to the Gentile believers."

Belsham.

"As believers, being raised to heaven, are represented as subject to a celestial hierarchy, (see chap. ii. 6; i. 20, 21), so unbelievers, dwelling upon earth, or in a world of darkness, are also figuratively described as subject to the dominion of evil spirits, of whom Satan, or the evil one, is the chief. This scenic representation, borrowed from the Oriental philosophy, is not to be understood literally. Principalities, powers, &c. express a personification of all wicked opposition to the Gospel, whether from the evil or the ecclesiastical power. The Primate, with Griesbach, omits the words *του αἰῶνος*, 'of this age,' which are in the received text. Mr. Simpson's interpretation is, 'we wrestle not against men merely, but against supreme governors, against powerful magistrates, against the rulers of this world of darkness, against spiritual wickedness in heavenly things.' Compare i. 20; ii. 6—10. By such rulers Paul was detained in prison while writing this Epistle."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

EPHESIANS vi. 13.

"Armour of God."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"The armour of God here described, is wholly allegorical; a plain proof that the persons against whom this armour is to be used, are also figurative and allegorical."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

EPHESIANS vi. 19.

"The mystery of the Gospel."

No. 1.

(ORIGEN.)

Origen, an Alexandrian, born A.D. 185, having early acquired a knowledge of the philosophy in vogue at his time, industriously blended it with the doctrines of Christ, and recommended it to the youths which he taught. His fame daily increasing, his manner of explaining the Christian principles also gained ground, till it became almost universal.

The Platonic Doctors of Egypt and other places, disrelishing the plain method of instructing their people, and explaining the Scriptures, struck off into the devious wilds of fancy, studying to subject the dictates of Jesus to their eclectic philosophy; and pretending deep researches into what appeared obvious and plain to every common Christian.

In this method, Origen was a principal leader. His fancy being wild, and his attachment to the Platonic philosophy, as modified by Ammonius, ex-

treme, he established a most pernicious mode of interpreting Scripture, in which he was followed by multitudes.

Pretending that an adherence to the plain and obvious meaning was the source of manifest evils, and that the literal sense of many passages could not be defended, he hunted for a spiritual and allegorical sense in the history of Scripture, as the heathen Platonists did in the history of their gods.

The hidden sense, which he often hunted after at the expense of truth and common sense, he divided into the moral and mystical; and the mystical into the allegorical, relative to the militant church, and the anagogic relative to the heavenly state.

Brown's General History, &c.

No. 2.

Gregory the Great asserted, that the *words* of the Sacred Writings are *images* of mysterious and invisible things.

No. 3.

(GROTIUS—COCCEIUS.)

The hypothesis of Grotius was, that “the predictions of the ancient prophets were all accomplished in the events to which they directly pointed before the coming of Christ; and that, therefore, the natural and obvious sense of the words and phrases, in which they were delivered, does not terminate in our blessed Lord; but that in certain of these predictions, and more especially in those which the writers of the New Testament apply to Christ, there is, besides the literal and obvious signification, a

hidden and mysterious sense that lies concealed under the external mask of certain persons, certain events, and certain actions, which are representatives of the person, ministry, sufferings, and merits of the Son of God.

The method of Cocceius was entirely different from this. He looked upon the whole history of the Old Testament as a perpetual and uninterrupted representation or mirror of the history of the divine Saviour, and of the Christian Church; he maintained, moreover, that all the prophecies have a literal and direct relation to Christ; and he finished his romantic system, by laying it down as a certain maxim, that all the events and revolutions that shall happen in the church, until the end of time, are pre-figured and pointed out, though not all with the same degree of evidence and perspicuity, in different places of the Old Testament.

Mosheim.

(See Note on Rev. viii. 1.)

For farther information respecting the doctrine of Cocceius, see Val Alberti *Διπλουν καπτα. Cartesianismus et Cocceianismus descripti et refutati*, Lips. 1678.

No. 4.

(HUTCHINSON.)

After Origen and other eminent commentators, Hutchinson asserted, that the Scriptures were not to be understood in a literal, but in an allegorical sense; that even the historical parts, and particularly those relating to the Jewish ceremonies and Levitical law, were to be considered in this light; and he asserted farther, that agreeably to this mode of interpreta-

tion, the Hebrew Scriptures would be found to testify amply concerning the nature and person of Jesus Christ.

See an Abstract of Mr. Hutchinson's Writings by the Dean of Canterbury. See also Mr. Jones's Lectures on the Figurative Language of Scripture.

No. 5.

(SWEDENBORG.)

Swedenborg also asserted that the Holy Scriptures contained an internal and spiritual sense, to which the outward and literal sense serves as a basis or receptacle; this spiritual sense extends to every part of Scripture, except the Acts of the Apostles.

See Burrowes' Encycl. and "the Beauties of E. Swedenborg," translated from the French by R. Socius.

PHILIPPIANS.

PHILIPPIANS i. 1.

"Bishops and Deacons."

No. 1.

(PURITANS.)

In the year 1570, Cartwright, a Puritan, raised several objections against the English hierarchy; of which the following are the most striking:

"The offices of the lawful ministers of the church, viz. Bishops and Deacons, ought to be reduced to the apostolical institution; the Bishops to preach the word of God and pray, and Deacons to take care of the poor.

"The names and functions of Archbishops and Deacons ought to be abolished, as having no foundation in Scripture."

Neal's Hist. of the Puritans.

No. 2.

(WESLEY.)

Wesley insisted upon a frequent and regular change of preachers, because he well knew that the attention of the people was always excited by a new performer in the pulpit, "I know," said he, "were

I to preach one whole year in one place, I should preach both myself and my congregation asleep. Nor can I believe it was ever the will of the Lord that any congregation should have one teacher only. We have found, by long and constant experience, that a frequent change of teachers is best. This preacher has one talent, that another. No one whom I ever yet knew, ~~has all the talents~~ which are needful for beginning and perfecting the work of grace in a whole congregation." The institution of the Jesuits allowed an itinerant father of the company to remain three months in a place, unless any other term were specified in his instructions: but Wesley went farther, and thought it injurious both to the preacher and people, if one of his itinerants should stay six or eight weeks together in one place.

See Southey's Life of Wesley, Life of Mr. Wesley by Dr. Whitehead, and another by Dr. Calk and Mr. Moore.

PHILIPPIANS ii. 6.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"Who, though in a divine form, did not think of eagerly retaining this divine likeness."—Wakefield's Translation.

"Who being in the form of God.—The form *μορφή*. Its proper signification is an external visible appearance. In this sense Christ could not resemble God who is invisible; the word is used there in a figurative sense."

Belsham.

*“ Who being in the form of God *, did not esteem as a prey this resemblance to God †.”—Unitarian Version.*

*“ * Form of God.—Being invested with extraordinary divine powers.”*

Lindsey's Second Address, p. 288.

“ † Resemblance to God.—The meaning is, he did not esteem this resemblance to God, these miraculous powers, as his own right, as a property acquired by his own exertions, and for the use of which he was not accountable. He regarded them as a trust committed to him by God, which therefore he was to exercise or to suspend as the purposes of his mission might require. See Belsham's Calm Enquiry, part i. sect. iii. 15, and the references there.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

PHILIPPIANS ii. 10.

“ At the name of Jesus, every knee shall bow.”

No. 1.

Queen Elizabeth issued the following injunction, A.D. 1559:

“ Artic. 52.—In the time of reading the litany, and all other collects and common prayer, all the people shall devoutly kneel; and when the name of Jesus shall be in any lesson, sermon, or otherwise pronounced in the church, due reverence shall be made of all persons with lowness of curtesy, and uncovering the heads of the menkind, as has been heretofore accustomed.”

No. 2.

(PURITANS.)

“The Puritans held, that all the names of God and Christ were to be had in equal reverence, and therefore considered it as beside all reason to bow the knee, or uncover the head only at the name of Jesus.”

See Neal.

One of the innovations of which Archbishop Laud was charged by the Puritans, on his trial for high treason, 1644, was bowing at the name of Jesus.

Neal.

No. 3.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“In *the name of Jesus*.”—Belsham’s Translation.

“*In the name, not at the name of Jesus, every knee shall bow, as his disciples, not his worshippers.*”

Belsham.

“*In the name of Jesus.*—Unitarian Version.”

“Dr. Jebb renders the preposition ‘to the name of Jesus, i. e. in acknowledgment of his religion every creature shall bend. For things above the earth, below the earth, &c. mean only that all human creatures shall acknowledge his religion.’ See Dr. Jebb’s Note apud Lindsey, p. 291.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

PHILIPPIANS iii. 20.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ *For we are citizens of heaven, whence indeed we are expecting a deliverer,*” &c.—Belsham, so also Wakefield’s Translation.

“ The Apostle always expresses himself as if the second coming of Christ was very near at hand ; so that some then living would be eye witnesses to it. 1 Thess. iv. 5. The times and seasons were not revealed to him, nor even to Christ himself. Acts i. 7.”

Belsham.

PHILIPPIANS iv. 3.

No. 1.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

“ *Sincere companion.*”—Roman Catholic Version.

“ Protestants render it *true yoke fellow*, to insinuate that St. Paul here speaks to his wife; whereas he plainly tells us, 1 Cor. vii. 8, that he had no wife.”

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

No. 2.

(QUAKERS.)

“ *Those women which laboured with me in the Gospel.*”

(See Note on Rom. xvi. 1.)

COLOSSIANS.

COLOSSIANS i. 3.

“ God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

(UNITARIANISM.)

“What more could have been said by any Unitarian? It is the same Being that is called our God and Father; and to whom our Saviour always prayed under the character of his God and Father. Where, therefore, is the evidence of Christ's having any nature superiour to ours?”

Priestley.

COLOSSIANS i. 14.

“ By whom we have this deliverance, even the remission of sins.”

Wakefield, so also Belsham's Translation.

“The three most valuable ancient versions, Syriac, Coptic, and Ethiopic, take no notice of the words *δια του αμαρτος αυτου.*”

Wakefield.

“ By whom we have redemption, even the forgiveness of our sins.”
Unitarian Version.

“ Redemption, i. e. deliverance from our heathen state ; which signifies the same as ‘ forgiveness of sin.’ Being now brought into a holy state, all which they had done in their state of heathenism, was no longer a bar to their admission into a state of reconciliation and privilege. In plain language, nothing which they had done in their heathen state excluded them from being members of the Christian community.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

COLOSSIANS i. 15.

*“ Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born *,” &c.*

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ Gen. i. 26. Man is said to be made in the image of God, as having dominion over the creatures ; and here Christ is represented as an image of God, as being the Sovereign of that kingdom which God has established in the world. Nor is there any reason to suppose, that Christ exercises any personal authority over believers : but as the dominion of Satan signifies the dominion, not of a real person, but of ignorance, idolatry, and vice, so the dominion of Christ is the dominion not of Christ personally, but of the doctrines and spirit of the Gospel.”

Belsham.

“ * *The first-born.*—*πρωτοτοκος*, an expression of endearment similar to the expressions beloved, ver.

13, and only-begotten, John iii. 16. See also Exod. iv. 22. The meaning may be, that Christ is the most distinguished person in the new dispensation—the chief of the prophets and messengers of God—as much superior to the rest as the first-born son is to the other children of the family. It may also have reference to priority in time as well as in rank, ver. 18. ‘*He was the first who rose from the dead.*’ ”

Belsham.

COLOSSIANS i. 16.

“*By him were all things created.*”

No. 1.

(HERMOGENES.)

Hermogenes, who lived in the second century, after having studied the Stoic philosophy, embraced the Christian religion, and united the philosophic principles of the one, with the divine doctrine of the other.

Regarding *matter* as the fountain of all evil, he could not persuade himself that God had created it from nothing by an almighty act of his will; and, therefore, he maintained, that the world, with whatever it contains, as also the souls of men, and other spirits, were formed by the Deity from an uncreated and eternal mass of corrupt *matter*.

In support of this opinion, he contended, that Scripture did not, in any place, teach us, that matter was created out of nothing.

“In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.”

In principio Deus fecit cœlum et terram.

Hermogenes translated the passage as follows: “In a principle (which was matter) God created the heaven and the earth.”

He argued, that according to Moses, before God formed the earth, it was without form, and invisible. (Gen. i. 2, “And the earth was without form, and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep,”) which words signify *matter* to be pre-existent, eternal, uncreated.

See Tertullian. cont. Hermogen.

“*In him* * *were created all things*†”—Belsham’s Translation.

“* *In him*.—All things are said to be created *in* him, *ἐν αὐτῷ*; by him, *δι’ αὐτοῦ*; and for him, *εἰς αὐτόν*.

“The Apostle appears evidently to intend a distinction which the generality of interpreters have overlooked. All things are created in him, i. e. all are new modelled under the Christian dispensation, or by the profession of Christianity. This is the proper sense of *ἐν αὐτῷ*. See Rom. xvi. 2. 7, 8.; 2 Cor. v. 17, where *ἐν Χριστῷ*, and similar phrases, evidently mean nothing more than professing Christianity. The consequence of which was such a change in their moral state, as might be called a new creation; an expression exactly similar to those which occur here. See also Gal. vi. 15.”

“† *Were created all things*, &c.—Observe, that the Apostle does not say that natural objects, the heavens, the earth, and the sea, &c. were made by Christ; the formation of these things is uniformly attributed to the Supreme Being. Moreover, if the observation in the preceding note be just, that the words *ἐν αὐτῷ*, in him, imply that this change took place in consequence of the Christian dispensation, it entirely precludes the notion of a creation of natural substances. Also, when the Apostle enters into the detail of things said to be created, he

mentions neither animate nor inanimate beings; neither angels nor men; but enumerates merely states of things, thrones, dominions, &c. which, whatever they mean, are not substances, but orders and ranks or conditions of being; so that nothing can be more astonishing than the confidence with which the generality of Christian interpreters explain this text, as asserting, that all natural substances, all worlds and all their inhabitants, and even celestial intelligences, angels, archangels, and the like, were created by Christ, than which nothing could be more remote from the Apostle's meaning."

Belsham.

"That the Apostle does not here intend the creation of natural substances is evident; for, first, he does not say that by him were created heaven and earth, but things in heaven and things on earth: secondly, he does not, in descending into detail, specify things themselves, viz. thrones, dominions, &c. which are only ranks and orders of beings in the rational and moral world: thirdly, it is plain from comparing ver. 15 and ver 18, that Christ is called the first-born of the whole creation, because he is the first who was raised from the dead to an immortal life: fourthly, the creation of natural objects, the heaven, the earth, and sea, and all things therein, when they are plainly and unequivocally mentioned, is uniformly and invariably ascribed to the Father, both in the Old Testament and the New. Hence it follows, that the creation which the Apostle here ascribes to Christ, expresses that great change which was introduced into the moral world, and particularly into the relative situation of Jews and Gentiles, by the dispensation of the Gospel.

This is often called creation, or the new creation, and is usually ascribed to Jesus Christ, who was the great prophet and messenger of the new covenant. See Eph. i. 10. ii. 10—15. iii. 9. iv. 24.; Col. iii. 10.; 2 Cor. v. 17. This great change the Apostle here describes under the symbol of a revolution introduced by Christ amongst certain ranks and orders of beings, by whom, according to the Jewish demonology, borrowed from the oriental philosophy, the affairs of states and individuals were superintended and governed. See Mr. Lindsey's *Sequel*, p. 477, and Westein in loc."

Note to the Unitarian Version.



COLOSSIANS i. 17.

"He is before all things," &c.

No. 1.

(BERYLLUS.)

Towards the middle of the third century, Beryllus, an Arabian bishop of Bozrah, renowned for piety and learning, taught, that Jesus Christ, before his incarnation, subsisted in the person of the Father, and had no personality of his own; and the Holy Ghost, issuing from God, as a portion of his nature, and superior to all souls, was united to Jesus at the time of his birth.

Origen pointed out the inconsistency of this doctrine with such force, that Beryllus renounced it and returned to the church.

Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. vi. cap. xx. p. 222, c. xxxiii. p. 231.

No. 2.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ He is above all things, and all these things are holden together in him.”—Wakefield’s Translation.

“ He is superior to all things, and all these things are holden together in him.”—Belsham’s Translation.

COLOSSIANS i. 23.

(QUAKERS.)

(See Note on Rom. ii. 14.)

COLOSSIANS ii. 9.

“ In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.”

No. 1.

Dr. Watts is supposed to have become a Sabellian towards the close of his life, and to have then written several pieces in defence of it.

His sentiments appear to have been, that the Godhead, the Deity itself, personally distinguished as the Father, was united to the man Christ Jesus; in consequence of which union or indwelling of the Godhead, he became properly God. This indwelling scheme, which has, no doubt, some appearance of Sabellianism, is chiefly founded on Colossians ii. 9. Where St. Paul, speaking of Christ, says, *“ In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.”*

Mr. Palmer, in his useful edition of Johnson’s Life

of Watts, observes, that “ Dr. W. conceived this union to have subsisted before the Saviour’s appearance in the flesh ; and that the human soul of Christ existed with the Father before the foundation of the world ; on which ground he maintains the real descent of Christ from heaven to earth, and the whole scene of his humiliation, which he thought incompatible with the common opinion concerning him. Dr. Doddridge is supposed to have been of these sentiments, and also Mr. Benjamin Fawcett, of Kidderminster, who published a valuable piece, entitled, ‘ *Candid Reflections concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity.*’ ”

See Evans’s Sketch.

No. 2.

(SWEDENBORG.)

This text, and John xii. 44, 45, were cited by Baron Swedenborg in support of his opinions respecting Jesus Christ.

See a work entitled “ The Beauties of E. Swedenborg,” translated from the French by R. Socius.

(See Note on 1 Cor. viii. 4.)

No. 3.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ *In him resideth substantially a fulness of divine communications.*”
Belsham’s Translation.

“ *Fulness of divine communications ; παν το πληρωμα της θεοτητος.* This text is the strong hold of what is called the indwelling scheme of the doctrine of the Trinity, of which Dr. Thomas Burnett, Dr. Watts, and Dr. Doddridge, are the most considerable advo-

cates ; the latter of whom would translate the text, ‘ in whom the whole fulness of the Deity substantially dwells.’ See Burnett’s *Scrip. Doc. of the Trinity*, p. 173, 174. But unless the advocates for this hypothesis mean to assert that the substance and consciousness of the Father is so united with the substance and consciousness of the created Logos, as to become one conscious, intelligent agent, called the Son, who is distinct both from the uncreated Father, and the created Logos, which is too absurd to be maintained, they mean nothing ; for in any other sense of indwelling, this famous hypothesis is compatible with Arianism, and even with perfect Unitarianism ; for it can mean nothing more than that God inspired Christ with the knowledge of his will, and enabled him to work miracles in confirmation of his mission. The Apostle’s expression lays no foundation for any such erroneous conclusion ; Eph. iii. 19. ; the Apostle prays that they may be filled with all the fulness of God ; but who supposes that the divine substance is intended ? The expression is universally understood, of divine communications ; and such, no doubt, is the sense of *θεοτης* in this passage, which no one will say is a stronger expression than *θεος*, and to argue from the word *σωματικως* is arbitrary in the extreme.”

Belsham.

“ In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Deity bodily.”

Unitarian Version.

“ Compare Eph. iii. 19, where Christians are said to be filled with all the fulness of God. ‘ The scholastic word *Godhead*,’ says Mr. Lindsey, ‘ is rejected, because to common readers it countenances the

strange notion of a God consisting of three persons.' Lindsey's Second Address, p. 283, 284."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

COLOSSIANS ii. 16.

" Or of the Sabbath-days."

(UNITARIANISM.)

" Sabbaths. Nothing can be more explicit than the Apostle's declaration of the entire abolition of the Jewish Sabbath, which is plainly no more obligatory upon Christians than the institution of the passover, or the rite of circumcision. The fourth commandment, therefore, is a precept which has no place in the Christian law, and ought never to be appealed to as an argument for a sabbatical institution. And it behoves those who think the observation of a day of sabbatical rest is of such high importance under the Christian dispensation, and who are so loud in their charges against those who deny, or, as they call it, profane the Sabbath, to shew what authority they have for this imposition. I see none. The old Sabbath is expressly repealed, and no new one is enjoined in its stead; always, however, keeping in mind the very obvious and important distinction between the Lord's day, as a weekly religious festival, in joyful commemoration of the resurrection of Christ, in which way it has been universally observed from the beginning, and as a day of sabbatical rest from the common employments and innocent amusements of life; for which there is no precept in the New Testament, and no example in

the primitive age : the practice of which was universally discountenanced in the primitive church, and which to this day prevails only in a small proportion of the Protestant churches in Europe, and among their descendants in America. In Justin's dialogue with Trypho, the Jew objects to Christians that, 'pretending to excel others, they observe no Sabbaths : ' Justin replies, 'The new law will have you keep a perpetual Sabbath. You, when you have passed a day in idleness, think you are religious. The Lord our God is not pleased with such things as these. If any one is guilty of perjury, or fraud, let him reform, if he be an adulterer, let him repent, and he will then have kept the kind of Sabbath truly pleasing to God. You see that the elements are never idle, and keep no sabbath. There was no need of the observation of Sabbaths before Moses, neither now is there any need of them after Jesus Christ.' Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho, p. 227. 229. 241. edit. Par. Evanson on the Sabbath, p. 92, 93."

Belsham.

COLOSSIANS ii. 18.

No. 1.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

*"Let no man seduce you, willing in humility * and religion of angels walking in the things which he hath not seen," &c.*

Roman Catholic Version.

" Willing in humility.—That is, by a self-willed, self-invented, superstitious worship, falsely pretending humility, but really proceeding from pride. Such*

was the worship that many of the philosophers (against whom St. Paul speaks, ver. 8,) paid to angels or to demons, by sacrificing to them as carriers of intelligence betwixt God and men, pretending humility in so doing, as if God was too great to be addressed by men; and setting aside the mediatorship of Jesus Christ; who is the head both of angels and men. Such also was the worship paid by the ancient heretics, disciples of Simon and Menander, to the angels, whom they believed to be the makers and lords of this lower world. This is certain, that they whom the apostle here condemns, did not hold the head, (ver. 19,) that is, Jesus Christ, and his mediatorship: and therefore what he writes here no ways touches the catholic doctrine and practice of desiring our good angels to pray to God for us through Jesus Christ. St. Jerome (Epist. ad Algas) understands by the religion or service of angels, the Jewish religion given by angels; and supposes all that is here said, to be directed against the Jewish teachers, who sought to subject the new Christians to the observances of the Mosaic law."

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

No. 2.

The Jews, after their return from captivity, were desirous of obtaining a more familiar knowledge of angels, and to distinguish them by their functions and names; thus they gradually acquired the habit of rendering them religious worship.

An ancient work, mentioned by St. Clement, of Alexandria, says, that the Jews worshipped angels and archangels, and even the months and the moon. Gaulmin, in his Notes to the History of

Moses, c. iv. p. 301, quotes a work of Rabbi Abraham Solomon, in which is a prayer directly addressed to the archangel St. Michael.

See Dictionn. des Hérésies. Art. Angeliques.

COLOSSIANS ii. 20.

"Why are ye subject to ordinances?"

(MOLTHER.)

The breach between Wesley and the Moravians was caused chiefly by Molther contending, that all persons were exempted from the ordinances; those who were without faith, because they ought not to use them; those who had faith, because they were not required to do it.

See Southey's Life of Wesley.

FIRST THESSALONIANS.

1 THESSALONIANS iii. 11.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ And our Lord Jesus Christ direct our way.”

“ Though God and Christ are here joined together, it is by no means a proper example of prayer to Christ; but as all power is given to Christ, with respect to his church, and he frequently appeared to Paul, and directed the course of his apostolical journeys, it was natural for him to desire to have the same direction to go where he wished himself.”

Priestley.

“ The Apostle, in his missionary labours, was under the immediate direction of Christ, who occasionally appeared to him for his guidance and encouragement. See Acts xxii. 17.; 2 Cor. xii. 8, 9.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

1 THESSALONIANS v. 17.

“ Pray without ceasing.”

(MESSALIANS OR EUCHYTES.)

The Messalians or Euchytes, a sect of the fourth century, imagined, according to the oriental notion, that the mind of man was inhabited by an evil demon; they contended, that by *constant prayer*, and singing of hymns, the soul was enabled to expel the demon, and might then be perfectly united with the divine essence.

See Epiphanius Hæres. 80. p. 1067. Theodoret. Hæret. Fabul. lib. iv. cap. 10. p. 672.

SECOND THESSALONIANS.

2 THESSALONIANS i. 2.

“ God our Father.”

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ It cannot but be observed, that in the usual tenor of Scripture language, God and Christ are carefully distinguished ; the appellation of God being given to the Father only, exclusively of Christ, as well as of all other beings.”

Priestley.

2 THESSALONIANS ii. 3.

“ Except there come a falling away.”

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

“ This revolt or falling off is generally understood, by the ancient fathers, of a revolt from the Roman empire, which was first to be destroyed before the coming of Antichrist. It may perhaps be under-

stood also of a revolt of many nations from the Catholic Church; which has in part happened already by the means of Mahomet, Luther, &c. and, as it may be supposed, will be more general in the days of Antichrist: though even then the Catholic* Church herself, if we believe the Scriptures and the Creed, never can fall off from Christ."

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.



2 THESSALONIANS ii. 15.

"Hold the traditions."

No. 1.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

"See here, that the unwritten traditions of the Apostles are no less to be received than their epistles."

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.



No. 2.

(HERRNHUTER.)

Dr. Southey, alluding to the Herrnhuters, when their sect was in its infancy, remarks, "it was taken into consideration more than once, whether they should lay aside their peculiar discipline for the sake of avoiding evil reports; Count Zinzendorf himself inclined at one time to this concession, and thought it better, that they should be entirely embodied in the Lutheran Church, with which they professed a perfect conformity in doctrine: the

* Where the infallibility of the church resided, the Romanists have differed among themselves; some resting it in the Pope, others requiring the concurrence of a general council.—*Southey's Book of the Church.*

brethren, who were then between five and six hundred in number, regarded the discipline as the precious inheritance which had been left them by their fathers, but they consented to let the question be decided by lot; in the full confidence that the decision would be directed by immediate providence. Two verses therefore of St. Paul were written on separate papers. The first was in support of Count Zinzendorf's motion, 'To them that are without law, be ye as without law, (being not without law to God, but under the law in Christ,) that ye may gain them that are without law.' The text of the second lot was this, 'Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught.' The trial was preceded by fervent prayer; a child of four years old drew the second lot; and they entered from that day (in their own words,) into a covenant with each other, to remain upon this footing, and in this constitution to carry on the work of the Lord, and to preach his gospel in all the world, and among all nations, whithersoever he should be pleased to send and scatter them abroad."

Southey's Life of Wesley.

FIRST TIMOTHY.

1 TIMOTHY ii. 5.

“ One Mediator.”

No. 1.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

“ This hinders not, but that we may seek the prayers and intercession, as well of the faithful upon earth, as of the saints and angels in heaven, for obtaining mercy, grace, and salvation, through Jesus Christ. As St. Paul himself often desired the help of the prayers of the faithful, without any injury to the mediatorship of Jesus Christ.”

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

No. 2.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ Here is no intimation that Christ was anything more than a man. A Mediator is one who is the medium of Divine communication, as Moses was to the Israelites. It does not at all imply the notion of *atonement* or *propitiation*.

Belsham.

“ Had the Apostle thought Christ to be a being of higher nature than that of man, it cannot be sup-

posed but that, in this place more especially, he would have denominated him by that higher rank, whatever it was; and especially if he had conceived him to be so great a being as the Maker of man and all things."

Priestley.

1 TIMOTHY ii. 6.

"Who gave himself a ransom for all."

No. 1.

(WESLEY.)

Preaching at Newgate, Wesley was led insensibly, he says, and without any previous design, to declare strongly and explicitly that God willeth all men to be saved, and to pray if this were not the truth of God, he would not suffer the blind to go out of the way; but if it were, that he would bear witness to his word. "Immediately one, and another, sank to the earth; they dropt on every side as thunder-struck." "In the evening I was again pressed in spirit to declare that Christ *gave himself a ransom for all*. And almost before we called upon him to *set* to his seal, he answered. One was so wounded by the sword of the spirit, that you would have imagined she could not live a moment. But immediately his abundant kindness was showed, and she loudly sang of his righteousness."

A Quaker who was present at one meeting, and inveighed against what he called dissimulation of these creatures, caught the contagious emotion himself, and even while he was biting his lips and knitting his brows, dropped down as if he had been struck by lightning. "The agony he was in," says

Wesley, "was even terrible to behold; we besought God not to lay folly to his charge, and he soon lifted up his head, and cried aloud, 'Now I know thou art a prophet of the Lord.'"

Southey's Life of Wesley.

No. 2.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"Who gave himself a deliverance for all."—Wakefield's Translation.

"One great mistake on this subject is, that the Apostle is understood to speak of deliverance from sin and its punishment, when he only means, deliverance from the yoke of Heathenism and the ceremonial law."

Belsham.

"A ransom, i. e. a means of deliverance from the bondage of the ceremonial law, and of heathen idolatry."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

1 TIMOTHY ii. 8.

"I will therefore that men pray."

The Arians and Socinians confine their worship to God the Father. The Moravians and Swedenborgians address all their prayers to Jesus Christ.

Adam's Religious World.

1 TIMOTHY ii. 9.

"That women adorn themselves in modest apparel."

(QUAKERS.)

(See Note on 1 Peter iii. 3.)

1 TIMOTHY iii. 2.

“The husband of one wife.”

No. 1.

(NOVATIAN AND NOVATUS.)

The followers of Novatian, a Presbyter of the Church of Rome, and of Novatus, a Presbyter of Carthage, condemned second marriages; and for ever excluded from their communion all those who after baptism had fallen into this sin.

Epiph. Hæres. Theod. Hæret. Fab. l. iii. c. 5.

No. 2.

(RUSSIAN CHURCH.)

In Russia the clergy are divided into regular and secular. The former are of the monastic order, the latter are of the parochial clergy; who are not only allowed to marry once, but formerly, a secular Priest could not be ordained without being married; and if his wife died, he was obliged to quit his priesthood, and either retire to a monastery, or submit to take some inferior office in the church; so strictly was he the “husband of one wife.” That practice is now changed; but still, the secular clergy are never permitted to marry twice, unless they relinquish their function and become laymen.

Adam's Religious World.

Mr. Gregory observes of the Greeks, “They approve of the marriage of Priests, provided they enter into that state before their admission into holy orders.

*“They condemn all fourth marriages.”**Gregory's History of the Christian Church.*

(See Note on Matt. xix. 11.)

1 TIMOTHY iii. 7.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“Snare of the accuser.”—Wakefield, so also Unitarian Version.

1 TIMOTHY iii. 16.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“And confessedly great is this mystery of Godliness, which was manifested in flesh, vindicated by the spirit, seen by messengers, proclaimed among Gentiles, believed on in the world, taken up with glory.”—Wakefield’s Translation.*

“Not Θεός, but ό or ός, is the reading of the Syriac, Coptic, Æthiopic, and Vulgate versions; otherwise Θεός would have stood very well, to the same sense as Matt. i. 23.”

“* *Messengers*—αγγελοις, viz. Apostles and preachers of the word, so called here, because our author was looking out for expressions to aggrandize the subject. See Acts iv. 20. x. 41.; Gal. iv. 14.; 1 John i. 1.; Rev. i. 20. &c.”

*Wakefield.**“He who was manifested in the flesh, was justified by the Spirit, seen by messengers*, preached to the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received in glory†.”—Unitarian Version.*

“The primate adopts the received text, ‘God was manifested,’ but in the margin he gives the reading retained here, which is also the reading in the text of Griesbach’s second edition. This is supported by the Alexandrine and Ephrem. MSS. The Vatican is mutilated. The Clermont reads (ο) *that which*. Later copies have Θεός, God. ‘All the old versions,’ says Dr. Clarke, (Doct. of Trin. No. 88, 89,) ‘have *who* or *which*. And all the ancient

fathers, though the copies of many of them have it now in the text itself, Θεός, God; yet, from the tenor of their comments upon it, and from their never citing it in the Arian controversy, it appears, that they always read it (ὅς) *who* or (ὃ) *which*.—*Note*, it must not be judged from the present copies of the text in Nyssen and others, but from their manner of commenting upon the place, how the text was read in their days.' Abp. Newcome observes, that if we read (ὅς) *he who*, we have a construction like Mark iv. 25.; Luke viii. 18.; Rom. viii. 32."

"* *Seen by messengers*.—By the Apostles, who were his angels or messengers to the world."

Benson.

"† *Met with a glorious reception*.—Benson, who refers to Acts xx. 13, 14. xxiii. 31.; Eph. vi. 15; 2 Tim. iv. 11, in support of this sense of the word ἀνεληφθῆ. He interprets the Apostle's language of the multitudes which, in the Apostolic age, embraced the Christian religion."

Note to the Unitarian Version.



1 TIMOTHY iv. 14.

"*Presbytery*."

No. 1.

(CALVIN.—PRESBYTERIANS.)

Calvin may be said to be the founder of Presbytery, having first established that form at Geneva* about 1541. John Knox and Andrew Melvil soon after introduced it into Scotland.

* See Spon Histoire de Genève.—Edition of 1730.

One of the great points which prevented an union between the Lutherans and Calvinists, was the form of church government. The Lutherans admitted what they esteemed an Apostolical ordinance, viz. a diversity in rank and precedence among the clergy. The Calvinists, more addicted to ecclesiastical republicanism, preferred that form of government which is termed Presbyterian.

Although the established Calvinists adopt the Presbyterian form of government, many societies, such as the Independents, Anabaptists, &c. who generally profess the Calvinistic doctrines, have a form and discipline peculiar to themselves.

No. 2.

(SMECTYMNUS.)

In a celebrated treatise, written in the reign of King Charles I. under the title of Smectymnuus, a fictitious word, made up of the initial letters of the names of the authors, viz. Stephen Marshal, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Young, Matthew Newcomen, and William Spurstow, respecting the Apostolical institution of diocesan episcopacy, it was contended, that a primitive Bishop was no other than a parochial pastor, or a preaching Presbyter, without inequality, or any proper rule over his brethren.

In opposing the Bishop's sole right of ordination, and sole right of spiritual jurisdiction, the Smectymnuan divines contended, that Bishops and Presbyters were originally the same; that ordination to the office of a Bishop does not differ from the ordination of a Presbyter; that there are no powers conveyed to a Bishop from which Presbyters are secluded; nor any qualification required in the one more than in the other; that admitting Timothy

was a proper Bishop, which they deny, yet that he was ordained by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, as well as of St. Paul. 1 Tim. iv. 14. That the origin of the order of Bishops was from the Presbyters choosing one from among themselves, to be a stated president in their assemblies, in the second or third century; that St. Jerome declares, once and again, that in the days of the Apostles, Bishops and Presbyters were the same; that as low as his time, they had gained nothing but ordination; and that St. Chrysostom and Theophylact affirm, that while the Apostles lived, and for some ages after, the names of Bishops and Presbyters were not distinguished.

See Neal.

The two houses passed an ordinance, Oct. 2, 1644, for the ordination of ministers pro tempore, which appointed ten persons, being Presbyters and members of the assembly, and also thirteen who were Presbyters of London but not members of the assembly, to examine and ordain, by imposition of hands, all those whom they shall judge qualified to be admitted into the sacred ministry.

Any seven or more to be a quorum; and all persons so ordained, to be reputed ministers in the Church of England, sufficiently authorized for any office or employment therein, and capable of all advantages appertaining to the same.

Others had full powers given them to ordain pro tempore in the county of Lancaster. To obviate the reproaches of the Oxford divines, the following clause was added, that "if any person do publicly preach, or otherwise exercise any ministerial office, that shall not be ordained, or thereunto allowed by

s, that there was a cement laid down in the of divine institution; the question, what that whether it was binding in both the Erastians and them. The proposition holds forth, that many, and, by divine institution the Presbyterial government thirty days; the Erastians against the Presbyterial institution, proper to be magistrate; but they were fine Right.

their name from Erastus, a German

ing to Erastus, was only persuasive, es over his students, without any power Lord's Supper, and other ordinances of e and open to all. The minister might nqualified from the communion, but might y kind of censure; the punishment of all al or religious nature, being reserved to the ned advantage of this scheme was, that it perium in Imperio, or two different powers in ent; it effectually destroyed all the spiritual e power over the consciences of men, which Popes, Prelates, Presbyteries, &c. and made church a creature of the state.

), the Independents composed a third party, against the proceedings of the high Presby- were small at first, but increased prodigiously to a considerable figure under the protec- well.

seven of the said ministers, their names shall be returned to both Houses of Parliament, to be dealt with as they, in their wisdom, shall think fit." It was noted further, that "no minister be allowed to preach, unless he has a certificate of his ordination, or at least of his being examined and approved by the assembly."

Neal.

The following is an account of the debate upon ordination, A.D. 1645.

When the passage in Timothy, of laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, was voted a full proof for Presbyters ordaining without a Bishop, Mr. Seldon, Lightfoot, and some others, entered their dissent, declaring, that the imposition of hands there spoken of, was only for admission to be an elder; and though elders might ordain elders, it did not necessarily follow that they might ordain a Bishop.

The Independents argued for the right of every particular congregation to ordain its own officers; this was debated ten days. The arguments on both sides were afterwards published by consent of the several parties, in a book entitled, "The Grand Debates between Presbytery and Independency." At length the question being put, that it is requisite no single congregation that can conveniently associate with others, should assume to itself the sole right of ordination, it was carried in the affirmative.

While the affair of ordination was depending in the assembly, committees were chosen to prepare materials for a new form of discipline and church government; a point of the greater consequence, because the old form was dissolved, and no other as yet established in its room. Here the Independents

agreed with the Presbyterians, that there was a certain form of church government laid down in the New Testament, which was of divine institution; but when they came to the question, what that government was? and, whether it was binding in all ages of the church? both the Erastians and Independents divided against them. The proposition was this: that the Scripture holds forth, that many particular congregations may, and, by divine institution, ought to be, under one Presbyterial government. The debate lasted thirty days; the Erastians* did not except against the Presbyterial government, as a political institution, proper to be established by the civil magistrate; but they were against the claim of a Divine Right.

* The Erastians derived their name from Erastus, a German divine of the sixteenth century.

The pastoral office, according to Erastus, was only persuasive, like a professor of the sciences over his students, without any power of the keys annexed. The Lord's Supper, and other ordinances of the Gospel, were to be free and open to all. The minister might dissuade the vicious and unqualified from the communion, but might not refuse it, or inflict any kind of censure; the punishment of all offences, either of a civil or religious nature, being reserved to the magistrate. The assumed advantage of this scheme was, that it avoided the erecting Imperium in Imperio, or two different powers in the same civil government; it effectually destroyed all the spiritual jurisdiction and coercive power over the consciences of men, which had been challenged by Popes, Prelates, Presbyteries, &c. and made the government of the church a creature of the state.

At this period, (1645), the Independents composed a third party, and made a bold stand against the proceedings of the high Presbyterians; their numbers were small at first, but increased prodigiously in a few years, and grew to a considerable figure under the protectorship of Oliver Cromwell.

No. 3.

King Charles' First Paper to the Parliament Divines.

"Newport, Oct. 2, 1648.

" Charles Rex.—I conceive that the episcopal government is most consonant to the word of God, and of an apostolical institution, as it appears by the Scripture to have been practised by the Apostles themselves, and by them committed and derived to particular persons as their substitutes or successors therein (as for ordaining presbyters and deacons, giving rules concerning Christian discipline, and exercising censures over presbyters and others,) and has ever since, till these last times, been exercised by bishops in all the churches of Christ; and therefore I cannot in conscience consent to abolish the said government.

" Notwithstanding this my persuasion, I will be glad to be informed, if our Saviour and his Apostles did so leave the church at liberty, as they might totally alter or change the government at their pleasure, which if you can make appear to me, then I will confess that one of my great scruples is clean taken away, and then there only remains,

" That being by my coronation oath obliged to maintain episcopal government, as I found it settled to my hands, whether I may consent to the abolishing thereof, until the same shall be evidenced to me to be contrary to the word of God."

The Parliament Divines, in answer to the first part of his Majesty's paper admit, that the Apostles did exercise the extraordinary powers he mentions, but deny, that they conferred them upon any particular persons as their substitutes or successors, and insist, that in Scripture there are only two

orders of officers (viz. bishops and deacons, Phil. i. 1. To the saints at Philippi that are in Christ Jesus, with the bishops and deacons ; and that the name, office, and work of a bishop and a presbyter is the same ; as in Titus i. 5, and 7. “ For this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldst ordain presbyters in every city ; for a bishop must be blameless, Acts xx. 27, 28. Paul called the presbyters together, and charged them to take heed to the flock over which the Holy Ghost had made them bishops, 1 Pet. v. 1, 2. The presbyters among you I exhort ; who also am a presbyter, feed the flocks of God among you, performing the office of bishops.) As the Apostles were extraordinary officers, so were Timothy and Titus, (viz.) evangelists, but neither of them were called bishops in Scripture, much less were they affixed to Ephesus or Crete, but travelled up and down to settle churches in several countries. They observe further, that in the same order of officers, there was not any one superior to another ; no Apostle above an Apostle, no presbyter above a presbyter, nor one deacon above another. They add, that the angels of the churches, in the Revelations are never called bishops, nor is the word used in any of St. John’s writings, who calls himself a presbyter ; from whence they argue the identity of these offices in Scripture, and the equality of the officers. They admit, that not long after the Apostles’ times, bishops are reported to have some superiority above presbyters, but this was not a divine, but an ecclesiastical institution, as is evident from the testimony of the most ancient fathers, and the most considerable writers in the Romish Church ; to which they add the suffrage of the first reformers in King Henry the Eighth’s reign. The

Erudition of a Christian Man, printed 1643, says expressly ~~that~~ the Scripture mentions but two orders, i. e. bishops or priests, and deacons. They conclude with observing, that the modern episcopacy is very different from that which began to obtain in the second and third ages of the church, insomuch that the present hierarchy, which is but an human institution, might be abolished, and the other remain.

After three days, his Majesty, with the assistance of his learned divines, replied to the foregoing paper, and acknowledged, “ That the words bishop and presbyter are sometimes confounded in Scripture; he admits, that presbyters are *Episcopi Gregis*, bishops of the flock; but that bishops are *Episcopi Gregis et Pastorum* within their several precincts, i. e. bishops of the flock and of their pastors too; and that soon after, common usage appropriated bishop to the ecclesiastical governor, leaving presbyter to signify the ordinary minister or priest, as appears from the ancient fathers and councils. He admits the calling of the Apostles and their gift to be extraordinary, but adds that their mission to govern and teach was ordinary and perpetual; and that the bishops succeeded them in the former, and presbyters in the latter function.

“ His Majesty still insists, That Timothy and Titus, were bishops, as appears from antiquity, and by a catalogue of twenty-seven bishops of Ephesus, lineally descended from Timothy, as is avouched by Dr. Reynolds against Hart, and therefore the distinction between an evangelist and a bishop is without a foundation; the work of an evangelist being no more than diligence in preaching the word, notwithstanding all impediments, according to the Apostle;

2 Tim. ii. 4, 5. His Majesty had said that the parliament divines had said nothing to prove, that the angels of the church were not personæ singulares, and such as had a prelacy over pastors i. e. bishops, but they dealt only in generals, and seemed unwilling to speak their opinions about them.

His Majesty affirms, "That bishops are the successors of the Apostles in all things not extraordinary, such as teaching and governing; and the reasons why they are not mentioned as a distinct order in the New Testament, are 1. Because the Apostles reserved to themselves the government of those churches where they appointed presbyters, and so it is probable the Philippians had no bishop when Paul writ to them; 2. Because in the epistles of Timothy and Titus, the persons to whom he writ being themselves bishops, there was no need to write about the qualifications of any other officers than those they wanted, which were presbyters and deacons only. His Majesty admits, concerning the ages after the Apostles, That they are but a human testimony, and yet may be infallible in matter of fact, as we infallibly know that Aristotle was a Greek philosopher. He avers the genuineness of those epistles of Ignatius, which give testimony to the superiority of a bishop over a presbyter: and though his Majesty's Royal Progenitors had enlarged the power and privileges of bishops, he conceives the government to be substantially the same."

Eleven days after, the Parliament Divines replied to the King's second paper, in which they say, that they can find no such partition in the Apostolical office, in Scripture, as his Majesty mentions, (viz.) that the governing part should be committed to bishops, the teaching and administering the sacra-

men, ~~men~~ presbyters: But that the whole work, per-
 ommitting things to presbyters; as appears from the
 two words used in the Acts of the Apostles, and St.
 Peter's Epistle, Ποιμαίνω, and Επισκοπεω, under the
 force of which words, the bishops claim the whole
 right of government and jurisdiction; and when the
 Apostle Paul was taking leave of the Ephesian
 presbyters and bishops, he commits the government
 of the church, not to Timothy, who was then at his
 elbow, but to the presbyters under the name of
 bishops, made by the Holy Ghost; from whence
 they conclude, that bishops and presbyters must be
 only two names of the same order. They observe,
 that the obscurity of the Church History in the time
 succeeding the Apostles made the catalogue-makers
 take up their succession upon report; and it is a
 blemish to their evidence, that the nearer they come
 to the days of the Apostles, they are the more doubt-
 ful and contradictory. These divines are therefore
 of opinion, that human testimony on both sides ought
 to be discharged, and the point in debate be deter-
 mined by Scripture. And here they take hold of
 his Majesty's concession, that in Scripture the names
 of bishops and presbyters are not distinguished; and
 that there is no mention but of two orders, bishops
 and deacons. They desire his Majesty to shew them,
 where the Scripture has assigned any particular
 work or duty to a bishop, that is not common to a
 presbyter, for they apprehend his Majesty assert-
 ing that a bishop is an ecclesiastical governor, and a
 presbyter an ordinary minister, without any demon-
 stration or evidence; a few clear passages of Scrip-
 ture for the proof of this (say they,) would bring the
 point to an issue. They deny his Majesty's distinc-
 tion of Episcopi Gregis, Pastorum, bishop of sheep

and shepherds, as being the point in question, and affirmed without any evidence.—“ That the office of teaching and governing was ordinary in the Apostles, because continued in the church, (we crave leave to say,) is that great mistake which runs through the whole file of your Majesty’s discourse ; for though there is a succession in the work of teaching and governing, there is no succession in the commission or office, by which the Apostles performed them : a succession may be to the same work, but not to the same commission ; and since your Majesty can’t produce any record from Scripture, warranting the division of the office of teaching and governing into two hands, we must look upon it but as an invention of men to get the power into their hands.”

These divines go on with a long proof that Timothy and Titus were evangelists ; that is, not fixed to one place, but travelling with the Apostles from one country to another to plant churches, and accordingly have drawn out an account of their travels from the Acts of the Apostles, and St. Paul’s Epistles. They observe the weakness of his Majesty’s reasons, why bishops are not mentioned as a distinct order in Scripture, and add a third of their own (*viz.*) Because really they were not. As for the Apostles reserving in their own hands the power of governing, they admit that they could no more part with it than with their Apostleship. Had they set up bishops in all churches, they had no more parted with their power of governing, than in setting up presbyters ; presbyters being called rulers, governors, and bishops, nor could the Apostle reasonably be supposed to commit the government of the church of Ephesus to the presbyters, when he was taking his last farewell of them, and yet reserve the power

of governing (in ordinary) to himself. His Majesty's other reason, (they say) is inconclusive, and in a sort begging the question. They add, that it is very unaccountable, that if there had been two sorts of bishops, one over presbyters, and the other over the flock, that there should be no mention, no mark of difference, no distinct method of ordination by which they might be distinguished, throughout the whole New Testament.

As to the ages after the Apostles, they admit there were presbyter bishops, but not of divine institution; that the catalogues of succession are undoubtedly defective, if they were not, it remains still to be proved, that the bishops in the catalogue were vested in the jurisdiction which the modern bishops claim.

These divines profess to honour the pious intentions of his Majesty's ancestors, and admit, that ornamental accessions to the person make no alteration in the office, but that the primitive episcopacy, and the present hierarchy, are essentially different. They acknowledge a subordination of the exercise of jurisdiction to the civil power, and the laws of the land; and conclude with thanks to his Majesty's condescension, in allowing them to examine his learned reply, clothed in such excellency of style, and pray, that a pen in the hand of such abilities may ever be employed in a subject worthy of it.

Some days after, his Majesty offered his last paper, wherein "he acknowledges the great pains of these divines to inform his judgment, and takes particular notice of the decency of their manner, and of their respectful address to him upon this occasion, but says they mistook him when they spoke

of a writ of partition of the episcopal office : whereas his meaning was, that the office of teaching was common both to the bishop, and presbyter ; but that government was peculiar to the bishop."

His Majesty declines answering to all the particulars, because he would not draw out the dispute into a greater length, but seems not convinced by any thing that had been offered ; he affirms that Timothy and Titus were *Episcopi Pastorum*, bishops over presbyters ; and that Timothy had a distinct work from presbyters, that is, that he might know how to behave himself in the exercise of his episcopal office. His Majesty relies on the numerous testimonies, and modern writers for the Scripture original of bishops, and adds, that the testimony of an equal number of equal credit to the contrary will signify nothing, because one witness for the affirmative, ought to be of more value than ten for the negative. In conclusion, his Majesty put them upon evidencing one of these three things, 1. either that there is no form of church government prescribed in Scripture ; or, 2. if there be, that the civil power may change it as they see cause ; or, 3. if it be unchangeable, it was not episcopal, but some other that they will name, for till this is done, he shall not think himself excusable for not consenting to the abolishing that government which he found settled at his coronation ; which is so ancient ; has been so universally received in the Christian world ; has been confirmed by so many acts of parliament, and subscribed by all the clergy of the Church of England.

No. 4. (SCOTCH KIRK.)

In the year 1689, the Scots Church* was permitted to follow the ecclesiastical discipline of Geneva, and was delivered from the jurisdiction of Bishops.

No. 5.

Of the sects that have separated from the Established Kirk of Scotland, the chief are,

The Cameronians, or Old Dissenters,
 The Seceders,
 The Members of the Relief Kirk,
 The Scottish Baptists,
 The Glassites, or Sandemanians,
 The Bereans, and
 The Scottish or New Independents.

1 TIMOTHY v. 12.

“ Their first faith.”

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

In the notes to the Roman Catholic English Testament, *“ their first faith ”* is explained to be the vow by which they had engaged themselves to

* The Kirk of Scotland has no instrumental music; no consecration of churches or of burying-grounds; no funeral service or ceremony; no sign of the cross in baptism; and no administration of the holy communion in private houses, not even to the sick or dying.—*Adam's Religious World.*

Christ; and this passage is quoted to prove, that the breach of the vow of continency is damnable.

See Note to the Roman Catholic Version, and the Table of Controversies.

1 TIMOTHY v. 21.

“The Lord Jesus Christ, and the chosen messengers.”

Unitarian Version.

“Chosen messengers, i. e. the Apostles of Christ, who were chosen to bear testimony to his resurrection.

“If it be objected that Timothy was not actually in the presence of the Apostles, it may be replied, that the Apostle’s language does not necessarily imply this.

“Nor can it be proved, that he was in the presence of the elect angels, whoever may be the persons intended.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

1 TIMOTHY vi. 20, 21.

“Avoiding prophane and vain babblings,” &c.

No. 1.

(GNOSTICS.)

St. Paul is supposed here to have alluded to the Gnostics, a name given to the first sect of heretics, who boasted of their superior wisdom on subjects of divinity, and piqued themselves upon teaching a doctrine sublime and difficult. -

That branch of Eastern philosophy, which, in the earliest ages of Christianity, occasioned so much disturbance to the church, was called Gnosis, or Science; and its adepts Gnostics, or men of knowledge. The principal tenets of this system were, “that there is much evil in the world; and men are, by some inward instinct, constrained to what their reason condemns: that the eternal mind, from which spirits derive their existence, is of a most perfect and beneficent nature, and so cannot be the author of evil: that matter alone being extrinsic to the Deity, it must be the centre and source of all evil and vice: that this matter could neither be created nor modified by the most perfect Deity, meanwhile they could not explain how it came to be so orderly arranged, or how celestial spirits, formed by the Supreme God in full perfection, were united to bodies formed out of the malignant mass of matter. Some thought there were two eternal principles, the one good and the other evil; the former of whom presided over light, and the latter over darkness. Others thought the ruler of matter was but a subordinate spirit, formed by the Deity; and that he ordered the rude mass of matter, and formed man. Others supposed the Supreme Deity quite different from both the Creator of the lower world, and the material evil principle. They pretended, that he was a most pure and radiant light, filling the Pleroma of infinite celestial space; that after living many ages in absolute solitude, he produced from his own essence a male and a female, perfectly like to himself; that these two produced in the Pleroma a large family of æons, or eternal; all of whom were unchangeable and immortal; but what was their number, they were not agreed: at last, one

of these ~~mons~~, noted for shining qualities of power and wisdom, but whose arrogance and ambition were quite insupportable, either by chance or by the express orders of the Deity, descended from the Pleroma into the region of unwieldly and malignant matter. After he had reduced it into order, he added to it a portion of the divine nature, or light, to correct its malignancy. This done, he created the various inhabitants of our world; and soon after excluded the Supreme God from all power over it, and demanded from men divine honours for himself and his associates in apostacy from the Deity. The spirits of men, though of a celestial origin, by their union to malignant matter, became exceedingly defiled and encumbered. The wicked demiurgus, or creator of the world, labours to retain them in this vile and miserable condition, while the Supreme Deity strives to render them free and happy. Such human souls, as by care and diligence throw off the demiurgan yoke, and subdue the turbulent lusts which spring from their body, shall, at death, ascend to the Pleroma to enjoy the Supreme God; but such as remain under the bondage of servile superstition and corrupt matter, shall, for their punishment, pass into new bodies, and continue to do so, till at last they be awakened from their sinful lethargy. At the end of time, the Most High God shall triumph over all opposition; and having delivered the greatest part of human souls from their servitude and imprisonment in mortal bodies, shall dissolve the frame of this world; and having restored tranquillity to the universe, shall, in the Pleroma, eternally reign with happy spirits in the most undisturbed felicity." It is evident, this old system partly owed its rise to revelation, interpo-

lated and perverted by human fancy; and gave rise to a multitude of errors, that have, in almost every age, troubled the Christian Church.

We find the Gnostic heretics were not only divided into many sects, differing in their various rules of religious faith, but in matters which related to practice. Whilst the more rigid sects rejected the most innocent gratifications, that the body might not be so nourished as to degrade the soul; their more relaxed brethren considered the soul as entirely unaffected by the actions of the body, asserted the innocence of complying with every dictate of nature, and abandoned themselves without any restraint to the impulse of the passions. Their persuasion that evil resided in matter, led them to reject the doctrine of the resurrection of the body; and their belief in the power of malevolent genii, the sources of every earthly calamity, induced them to have recourse to the study of magic, to weaken or avert the influence of those malignant agents. A very considerable sect of Gnostics distinguished themselves by the name of Docetæ; but their peculiar opinions are not accurately known.

See Mosheim, Brown, and Gregory.

No. 2.

Plutarch resolves, that as whatsoever is good in the soul and body of the universe, and likewise in the souls of men and demons, is to be ascribed to God as its only original, so whatsoever is *evil*, irregular, and disorderly in them, ought to be imputed to this other substantial principle, a ψυχὴ ἄνοος καὶ κακοποιός, which insinuating itself every where

throughout the world, is all along intermingled with the better principle, *καὶ μὴ πᾶν εἶναι ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν ψυχὴν*, so that neither the soul of the universe, nor that of men and demons, was wholly the workmanship of God, but the lower, brutish, and disorderly part of them the effect of the evil principle.

Cudworth, book i. cap. iv. p. 215.

Plutarch endeavours to persuade us, that this was the constant belief of all the pagan nations, and of all the wisest men and philosophers that ever were amongst them. "For this," saith he, in his book *de Iside et Osiride*, "is a most ancient opinion, that hath been delivered down from theologers and law-makers, all along to poets and philosophers; and though the first author thereof be unknown, yet hath it been so firmly believed every where, that the footsteps of it have been imprinted upon the sacrifices and mysteries, or religious rites, both of barbarians and Greeks; viz. that the world is neither wholly ungoverned by any mind or reason, as if all things floated in the streams of chance and fortune, nor yet that there is any one principle steering and guiding all, without resistance or control; because there is a confused mixture of good and evil in every thing, and nothing is produced by nature sincere. Wherefore, it is not only the Dispenser of things, who as it were out of several vessels distributeth those several liquors of good and evil, mingling them together and dashing them as he pleaseth; but there are two distinct and contrary powers or principles in the world, one of them always leading as it were to the right hand, but the other tugging a contrary way. Insomuch that our whole life and the whole world is a certain mixture

and confusion of these two; at least the terrestrial world below the moon is such, all being every where full of irregularity and disorder. For if nothing can be made without a cause, and that which is good cannot be the cause of evil, there must needs be a distinct principle in nature for the production of evil as well as good. And this hath been the opinion of the most and wisest men, some of them affirming, θεοὺς εἶναι δύο καθάπερ ἀντιτίκνους, that there are two gods, as it were, of contrary crafts and trades, one whereof is the maker of all good, and the other of all evil; but others calling the good principle only a God, and the evil principle a demon, as Zoroaster the magician."

Besides which Zoroaster and the Persian Magi, Plutarch pretends that the footsteps of this opinion were to be found also in the astrology of the Chaldeans, and in the mysteries and religious rites, not only of the Egyptians, but also of the Grecians themselves; and lastly, he particularly imparts the same to all the most famous of the Greek philosophers, as Pythagoras, Empedocles, Heraclitus, Anaxagoras, Plato, and Aristotle; though his chief endeavour of all be to prove, that Plato was an undoubted champion for it.

Cudworth, book i. cap. iv. p. 217.

St. Athanasius speaks also of some degenerate Christians who fell into this error.

Οἱ θε ἀπὸ τῶν αἵρέσεων ἐκπεσόντες τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς διδασκαλίας, καὶ περὶ τὴν πίστιν ναυαγήσαντες, καὶ οὗτοι μὲν ὑπόστασιν τοῦ κακοῦ περαφρονοῦσιν εἶναι. Some heretics, forsaking the ecclesiastical doctrine, and making shipwreck of the faith, have, in like manner, falsely attributed a real nature and essence to evil. Of

which heretics there were several sects before the Manicheans, sometimes taken notice of and censured by pagan philosophers themselves. As by Celsus, where he charges Christians with holding this opinion, that there is *ἐναντίος τῷ μεγάλῳ Θεῷ θεὸς κατηραμένος*, an execrable god contrary to the great God, and by Plotinus, writing a whole book against such Christians, the ninth of his second Ennead, which by Porphirius was inscribed, *πρὸς τοὺς Γνωστικούς*, against the Gnostics.

Cudworth, book i. cap. iv. p. 224.

The Gnostics, in Plotinus' time, asserted the world to have been made, not so much from a *principle essentially* evil and eternal, as from a lapsed soul.

Cudworth, l. i. c. 4. p. 291.

No. 3.

(AMMONIUS SACCUS.)

Ammonius Saccus, who taught in the school at Alexandria towards the close of the second century, adopted the doctrines of the Egyptians concerning the universe and the Deity, as constituting one great whole; the eternity of the world, the nature of souls, the empire of providence, and the government of the world by demons. These sentiments he associated with the doctrines of Plato, by adulterating some of the opinions of that philosopher, and forcing his expressions from their obvious and literal sense; and to complete his conciliatory scheme for the restoration of true philosophy and the union of its professors, he interpreted so artfully the doctrines of the other philosophical and religious sects, that they

appeared closely to resemble the Egyptian and Platonic systems.

This philosophical system was soon embraced by those among the Alexandrian Christians, who were desirous to unite the profession of the Gospel with the dignity, the title, and the habit of philosophers. The school of Ammonius extended itself from Egypt over the whole Roman empire; but its disciples were soon divided into various sects. Ammonius laid the foundation of that sect which was distinguished by the name of the New Platonics.

See Mosheim, Gregory, and Burrowe's Encyc.

No. 4.

(CERDO AND MARCION.)

In the second century, Cerdo and Marcion erected, on the foundation of the Gnostics, a structure of considerable extent.

To the two principles of good and evil, admitted by the Gnostics, they added a third, whom they conceived to be the Creator of the world and the God of the Jews; and asserted, that he was in a state of continual hostility with the evil principle, but desirous of usurping the place of the Supreme Being. Mankind, they asserted, were governed despotically by the two former of these beings; but added, that the Great Supreme had sent down his own Son for the deliverance of all, who, by self-denial and austerity, sought to obtain that happiness.

The followers of Cerdo and Marcion were distinguished by the name of the latter. They entirely rejected the Old Testament, and the whole of the New, except part of the Gospel of St. Luke, and

ten Epistles of St. Paul, which were greatly interpolated. This sect was diffused, not only through Rome and Italy, but extended itself over Palestine, Syria, and Egypt.

See Tertullian's five books against the Marcionites, Tillemont's Mémoires, and Beausobre's Histoire du Manicheisme.

SECOND TIMOTHY.

2 TIMOTHY 1. 9.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ In Christ Jesus before the ages.”—Wakefield.

“ In Christ Jesus before the ancient dispensations.”
Unitarian Version.

2 TIMOTHY i. 13.

“ Hold fast the form of sound words.”

(QUAKERS.)

The Quakers consider that this command is broken by addressing an individual in the plural number, the origin of which custom they ascribe to vanity and pride. Also, by giving the names of the heathen deities to days and months.

See Tuke.

Mr. Gurney says, “ It is the practice of Friends to avoid the commonly adopted names of months and days, and to indicate those periods by numerical appellations, according to the order of their succession ; as the first, second, or third month ; the first, second, or third day, &c. The reason for making

this alteration, is simple and forcible. All the days of the week, and many of the months of the year, have received the names by which they are usually described, in honour of false gods. Thus, January is the month of Janus; Thursday, the day of Thor, &c. This relic of heathenism is not only needless and indecorous, but, according to our sentiments, is opposed to the tenor and spirit as well as to the letter of those divine commandments addressed to the Israelites, which forbid the use of the names of false gods, and every other the slightest approach to idolatrous purposes. See *Exod. xxiii. 13*; *Josh. xxiii. 7*. Compare *Deut. xii. 3*.; *Ps. xvi. 4*, &c. Idolatry was indeed a sin which easily beset that ancient people, and to which, in the present enlightened state of society, Christians are but little tempted. But it will scarcely be denied, that the various precepts contained in the Old Testament on the subject, form a part of that law which changes not; and that the standard of truth, in this particular, was heightened rather than lowered, by the introduction of the Gospel dispensation. Although, therefore, we may now be in little or no danger of falling away into the worship of false gods, it appears that the maintenance of a custom which had its origin in such worship, and by which a verbal honour is still given to ideal deities, or to devils, is inconsistent with the pure piety and unmixed devotion of the simple Christian.

“ May it not be considered, in some degree, discreditable to the religious profession of our country, that the votes of the British Parliament, passed as they are after the daily recitation of prayers addressed to the ever blessed Jehovah in the name of Christ, should, when printed, uniformly bear about

them the stamp of classical heathenism? These documents are dated in Latin; ‘Die Veneris, Quarto Martis; Die Mercurii, Secundo Julii, &c.’”

2 TIMOTHY ii. 26.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ And they who have been taken captive by the accuser, may recover themselves out of his snare, to the will of God.”

Unitarian Version.

“ i. e. They who through fear of calumny and persecution have apostatized from the Christian faith. 1 Tim. iii. 6, 7. 11. See Simpson on the existence of the devil, p. 147.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

2 TIMOTHY iii. 16.

“ All Scripture.”

No. 1.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

“ Every part of divine Scripture is certainly profitable for all these ends. But if we would have the whole rule of Christian faith and practice, we must not be content with those Scriptures which Timothy knew from his infancy, that is, with the Old Testament alone; nor yet with the New Testament, without taking along with it the traditions of the Apostles, and the interpretation of the church, to which the Apostles delivered both the book and the true meaning of it.”

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

No. 2.

(SOCINUS.)

The followers of Socinus denied the plenary inspiration of the sacred writers, and insinuated that mistakes had crept into their writings.

Sandii Biblioth. Antitrinit. Lamy, Hist. du Socianisme.

No. 3.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"Every writing inspired by God, is useful for doctrine," &c.

Wakefield's Translation,

"All the old versions omit *καὶ* before *ωφελιμος*, except the Ethiopic, whose single testimony is with me, I own, equivalent to all the rest in a difficult or disputed passage. In that case, we must retain the old translation, referring *γραφη* to the writings just mentioned."

Wakefield.

"All Scripture, given by inspiration of God, is also profitable," &c.

Unitarian Version.

" 'All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable,' &c. Newcome. But in his note the primate observes, that 'some render, *All Scripture, given by inspiration of God, is profitable, &c.* So Syr. the three Arabic versions, Vulg. Grotius, the English Bible of 1549, &c. Thus it is not defined what Scripture was divinely inspired.' "

Note to the Unitarian Version.

2 TIMOTHY iv. 4.

"Unto fables."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"The doctrines to which the Apostle alludes, were undoubtedly those of the Gnostics. He did not live long enough to see the rise of other and greater corruptions of Christianity, though they were in some respects of a similar nature. Had the Apostle lived to have seen the rise and progress of such doctrines, as the Trinity, original sin, predestination, and atonement, his indignation would have risen much higher than it did against any doctrines held by the Gnostics, because they were much further removed from the genuine principles of Christianity. Compared with these doctrines, which infringe upon the great article of the unity of God, and which derogate from the equitable principles of his moral government, the notions of the Gnostics were only idle fables."

Priestley.

TITUS.

TITUS ii. 11.

"The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men," &c.

(QUAKERS.)

This is a text often referred to by the Quakers, as conveying in the clearest manner their belief in the quality, the universality, and the effects of divine grace.

(See Note on Rom. ii. 14.)

TITUS ii. 13.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"Gladly entertaining the happy expectation of the glorious manifestation of the great God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ."

Wakefield's Translation.

"Earnestly expecting that blessed hope, even the manifestation of the glory of the great God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ."

Belsham's Translation.

"From this expression some have inferred, that Jesus Christ and the great God were the same per-

son ; but a saying of our Saviour himself will clearly explain this ; he says, that he shall return in his own glory, and in the glory of his Father and of the holy angels. The appearance of the great God, therefore, signifies nothing more than that glorious presence of God which will accompany Jesus Christ when he shall return to raise the dead and judge the world."

Priestley.

TITUS ii. 14

"Redeem us from all iniquity,"

(UNITARIANISM.)

"Here we see the true meaning of Christian redemption ; it is a deliverance from iniquity and all the effects of it, by making us virtuous and good, and by no means a deliverance from the wrath of God by the death of Christ."

Priestley.

TITUS iii. 10.

"An heretic."

No. 1.

"A decree was obtained in the fourth Council of Lateran, that all heretics should be delivered over to the civil magistrates to be burnt."

Neal.

Such was the spirit of the times, that some foreign heretics being found in England in 1180, and

being condemned by the bishops, they were beaten with sticks, scourged, burnt in the face, and turned adrift; and no person being permitted to harbour them, they all perished with cold and hunger.

Fleury, quoted by Jortin.

No. 2.

(THE INQUISITION.)

At the commencement of the thirteenth century, Innocent III. sent legates extraordinary into the southern provinces of France, to perform what the bishops had left undone, and to extirpate heresy, in all its forms and modifications, without being at all scrupulous in using such methods as might be necessary to effect this salutary purpose.

The persons charged with this commission were Rainier, a Cistercian monk, and Pierre de Castelnau, archdeacon of Magdelone, who became also afterwards a Cistercian friar.

These eminent missionaries were followed by several others, among whom was the famous Spaniard, Dominic, who, returning from Rome, in the year 1206, fell in with these delegates, embarked in their cause, and laboured both by his exhortations and actions for the extirpation of heresy.

These spiritual champions, who engaged in this expedition upon the sole authority of the pope, without either asking the advice or demanding the assistance of the bishops, and who inflicted capital punishment upon such of the heretics as they could not convict by reason and argument, were distinguished in common discourse by the title of the *Inquisitors*, and from them the formidable and odious tribunal called the Inquisition, derived its origin.

From this period we are to date the commencement of the dreadful tribunal of the Inquisition, which in this and the following ages subdued such a prodigious multitude of heretics, part of whom were converted to the church by terror, and the rest committed without mercy to the flames.

The Dominicans erected first at Thoulouse, and afterwards at Circassione, and other places, a tremendous court, before which were summoned not only heretics and persons suspected of heresy, but likewise all who were accused of magic, sorcery, judaism, witchcraft, and other similar offences. This tribunal, in process of time, was erected in the other countries of Europe, though not every where with equal success.

Burrowe's Encyclop.

No. 3.

Neal, alluding to the transactions of parliament, A.D. 1648, informs us, that May 1st it was voted, that all ordinances concerning church government, referred to committees, be brought in and debated; and that the ordinances against blasphemy and heresy be now determined; which was done accordingly.

This was one of the most shocking laws, as Neal observes, that can be met with, and shews that the governing Presbyterians in these times would have made a terrible use of their power, if it had been supported by the sword of the civil magistrate. The ordinance is dated May 2, 1648, and ordains, "That all persons who shall willingly maintain, publish, or defend, by preaching or writing, the

following heresies with obstinacy, shall upon complaint or proof, by the oaths of two witnesses, before two justices of the peace, or confession of the party, be committed to prison without bail or mainprize, till the next gaol delivery; and in case the indictment shall then be found, and the party upon his trial shall not abjure his said error, and his defence and maintenance of the same, he shall suffer the pains of death, as in case of felony, without benefit of clergy; and if he recant or abjure, he shall remain in prison till he find sureties that he will not maintain the said heresies or errors any more; but if he relapse and is convicted a second time, he shall suffer death as before. The heresies or errors are these following:

“ 1. That there is no God.

“ 2. That God is not omnipresent, omniscient, almighty, eternal, and perfectly holy.

“ 3. That the Father is not God, that the Son is not God, that the Holy Ghost is not God, or that these three are not one eternal God, or that Christ is not equal with the Father.

“ 4. The denial of the manhood of Christ, or that the Godhead and manhood are distinct natures; or that the humanity of Christ is pure and unspotted of all sin.

“ 5. The maintaining that Christ did not die, nor rise again, nor ascend into heaven bodily.

“ 6. The denying that the death of Christ is meritorious on the behalf of believers; or, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.

“ 7. The denying that the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the word of God.

“ 8. The denying of the resurrection of the dead, and a future judgment.”

The ordinance goes on to mention some other errors of less demerit, and says, "That whosoever shall maintain or defend them, shall, upon conviction, by the oaths of two witnesses, or by his own confession before two justices of the peace, be ordered to renounce his said error or errors in the public congregation of the parish from whence the complaint comes, or where the offence was committed, and in case of refusal, he shall be committed to prison till he find sureties that he shall not publish or maintain the said error or errors any more. The errors are these following :

" 1. That all men shall be saved.

" 2. That man by nature hath free will to turn to God.

" 3. That God may be worshipped in or by pictures or images.

" 4. That the soul dies with the body, or after death goes neither to heaven, or to hell, but to purgatory.

" 5. That the soul of man sleeps, when the body is dead.

" 6. That the revelations, or workings of the Spirit, are a rule of faith or Christian life, though diverse from or contrary to the written word of God.

" 7. That man is bound to believe no more than by his reason he can comprehend.

" 8. That the moral law contained in the Ten Commandments is no rule of the Christian life.

" 9. That a believer need not repent, or pray for pardon of sin.

" 10. That the two sacraments, of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, are not ordinances commanded by the word of God.

" 11. That the baptism of infants is unlawful and

void; and that such persons ought to be baptized again.

“ 12. That the observation of the Lord’s Day, as enjoined by the ordinances and laws of this realm, is not according or is contrary to the word of God.

“ 13. That it is not lawful to join in public or private prayer, or to teach children to pray.

“ 14. That the churches of England are no true churches, nor their ministers and ordinances true ministers and ordinances, or that the church government by presbyters is antichristian or unlawful.

“ 15. That the magistracy, or power of the civil magistrate, by law established in England, is unlawful.

“ 16. That all use of arms, though for the public defence, (and be the cause never so just,) is unlawful.”

HEBREWS.

HEBREWS i. 2.

"By whom also he made the worlds."

No. 1.

(ARIANS.)

The high Arians, approaching in opinion to those that have been called Semiarians*, or rather to the ancient Arians, whilst they believe the Father to be the one supreme God over all, absolutely eternal, underived, unchangeable, and independent, conceive the Son to be the first derived being from the Father, and under him employed in creating, and also in preserving and upholding the world, and in exercising a moral as well as natural administration over mankind : so that under this distinguishing character, he is invested with the office of final Judge.

Of these high Arians, some suppose, that Jesus Christ, sustaining relations, and exercising offices

* The Semiarians agreed with the Arians in rejecting the word *ὁμοουσιος*, but differed from them in carrying the perfections and the dignity of the Son higher than the Arians did, and in affirming that he was *ὁμοιουσιος*, of like substance, and like to his Father in all things.—See *Dr. Jortin's Remarks on Eccles. Hist.* vol. ii. p. 51.

so honourable in themselves, and so interesting to mankind, is a proper object of subordinate worship; whilst others imagine, that worship, in the proper and discriminating sense of the term, belongs only to the Father, the self-existent, infinite, and supreme Deity.

Some Arians of this class have maintained, that the Son of God, before his incarnation, had only, or chiefly, the care and government of the Jewish people allotted to him, whilst other angels were appointed presidents, or princes, of other nations and countries.

This was the opinion of Mr. James Pierce, an ingenious and learned commentator. See his Paraphrase and Notes, &c. on Coloss. ii. 15, and Hebrews ii. 9.

Others have also maintained, that the conduct of all the dispensations of Providence, in every period of time, as they related to the patriarchs, to the Jewish nation, to the prophets, to Christians, and to the world in general, has been intrusted to Christ; and that he was distinguished by various appropriate titles, as Jehovah, the Angel of the Covenant, the Angel Jehovah, the Angel of the Presence, and the Logos, &c. &c. To this purpose they alleged, among other arguments, the declaration of the Apostle, (Heb. i. 2, ii. 3.) that it was by Christ God made the worlds, *αιωνας*, the ages, or dispensation; i. e. by whom God formerly disposed those eminent and remarkable periods of time, the antediluvian, the patriarchal, the Mosaic, and the present, being put under his government, according to the will of the Father. See Ben Mordecai's Apology, Letter 2, *passim*. It is also alleged, as a further presumption in favour of this hypothesis, that the sacred writings

contain a revelation and history of the administration of Providence with regard merely to the inhabitants and concerns of our world, or of the terrestrial globe; and, of course, that the subordinate direction and superintendence of this part of the government of the supreme and infinite Sovereign of this and innumerable other worlds, is intrusted with Jesus Christ; a superior being, adapted, by his pre-existent dignity, and extraordinary perfections and powers, to the office of ruler and judge.

Adam's Religious World.

The low, or modern Arians, is a title by which the advocates of the hypothesis of the simple pre-existence of Christ are willing to be distinguished.

Adam's Religious World.

No. 2.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"Whom he appointed Heir of all things, through whom also he established the ages."—Wakefield's Translation.

"Whom he hath appointed Heir of all things, with a view to whom he even constituted the former dispensations."

Belsham's Translation.

"With a view to whom; δι' ου και τους αιωρας εποινεν. Αιων, though it may sometimes signify *world*, which is, however, doubted by Sykes; yet it is often used for age or dispensation; Matt. xii. 32. xiii. 39.; Mark x. 30.; Luke xviii. 30.; 1 Cor. ii. 6. 10, 11.; Col. i. 26.; Heb. vi. 5. 9. 26. Δια, with a genitive, commonly expresses the instrumental cause, but sometimes also the final cause, and in this sense

Grotius understands it here, and supposes a reference to an old proverb amongst the Jews, that the world was made for the Messiah. He appeals to Beza in support of this interpretation of δι' οὗ. Beza on Rom. vi. 4. See also the Scholiast on the Plutus of Aristophanes, p. 6, ed. Basil. Also Thucydides Hist. lib. vi. δι' οὗπερ πάντα ἐκινδυνεύουν, for whose sake they put every thing to hazard; δια λόγον, with a view to conversation; Joseph. Antiq. lib. xviii. c. 7, 8. c. x. §. 3.; δια νοός, with a view to be understood; 1 Cor. xiv. 19. See Locke on the place. I think the words should be translated, 'for whose sake,' or, 'upon whose account, he made even the ages.' Dr. Chandler, on Eph. i. 11. This is a remarkable concession, as Dr. Chandler was a high Arian, of which doctrine this text is commonly regarded as one of the chief arguments; Mr. Simpson, Ess. 8, considers the plural form as the Hebrew superlative, by which he constituted the ages τοὺς αἰῶνας—q. d. this last and most important dispensation, the dispensation of the Messiah. According to this interpretation, the preposition retains its usual signification. 'Per Christum vere nova et alia secula Deus condidit, dum per eum plane novam, et a priore longe diversam, rerum ac mundi faciem induxit. Secula Deus per Christum fecisse dicitur, non quod omnia quæ unquam extiterunt secula per eum condiderit, sed quod condiderit aliqua, nempe nova et a prioribus diversa iisque longe feliciora.' Crellius; Slichtingius."

Belsham.

“ In the last of these days hath spoken to us by his Son, whom he hath appointed Heir of all things, for whom also he constituted the Ages.”—Unitarian Version.

“ Δι’ ου, for whom. For this sense of δια, with a genitive, see Grotius in loc. Schleusner in verb. and Mr. Lindsey’s Second Address, p. 297. Αἰῶνες, ages; ‘ This word,’ says Dr. Sykes, in loc. ‘ does not signify the heavens and earth, and all things in them, but it means, properly, ages, or certain periods of time; the antediluvian, the patriarchal, and the Mosaic ages or dispensations. These were all intended to prepare the way for the age or dispensation of the Messiah.’ Archbishop Newcome adopts the common translation, ‘ by whom he made the worlds also.’ Ages; the plural for the superlative singular. See Eph. i. 10. ii. 2.; 1 Cor. x. 11.; Tit. i. 3.; Heb. ix. 26. Simpson’s Ess. viii. With this interpretation of Αἰῶνες, δια may retain its usual signification of the instrumental cause: q. d. by whom he introduced this his chief dispensation to mankind.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.



HEBREWS i. 3.

“ Who, being a ray of his brightness, and an image of his perfections, and upholding all things,” &c.—Wakefield’s Translation.

*“ Who being * an effulgent ray of his brightness, and an exact image of himself†, and conducting all things ‡ by his powerful authority,” &c.—Belsham’s Translation.*

*“ * Who being—This context contains a description in highly figurative language of the character and condition of Jesus as the Messiah. He is distinguished from all preceding prophets, as a son*

from a servant. He is made heir of all things, that is, Jews and Gentiles are equally the subjects of his kingdom. N.B. For this sense of the phrase 'all things,' see an excellent dissertation by Mr. Tyrwhitt, in commentaries and essays, vol. ii. No. 1; with a view to him all former dispensations were arranged. He is a ray of divine brightness, as he clearly teaches the will of God: he is an exact image of God himself, as he controlled the laws of nature at pleasure, by the voluntary power of working miracles, which was imparted to him: he conducts all things by the powerful authority of God: his cause and kingdom are carried on in the world by the irresistible agency of the Almighty: he made purification of sin: he consecrated a new and holy community to God, and he is set down at the right-hand of Supreme Majesty, or of the Majesty on high, as he is risen from the dead, has ascended to heaven, and is advanced to universal spiritual dominion."

Belsham.

"† *Exact image of himself*—*χαρακτηρ της ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ*. *Χαρακτηρ* is the engraving of a seal, or the impression made by a seal upon wax. *ὑποστασις* is substance: the image of his substance is the image of himself. See 2 Cor. ix. 4. Slichtingius, Crellius, and Grotius in loc. The meaning is probably the same as that of *ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ*. Phil. ii. 6, and is to be explained of the possession of miraculous powers. Christ being the image of God, no more proves his participation of the divine nature, than Adam being made in the image of God, proves him to have been also divine. Sykes has a note upon the word *hypostasis*, which he says, 'seems never to have been used to

signify person, till long after St. Paul's days, and should not be rendered so here.' We find the term in metaphysical books applied to certain properties of the One God, as eminently subsisting in him. Plato talks of three hypostases, not meaning three persons; for unity and goodness made two of these hypostases. Taking these hypostases as signifying essence, with its properties; the Son is properly the image or just representation of God's properties, goodness, kindness, &c."

See Belsham.

" † *Conducting all things*—Φερων τε τα παντα τω ρηματι της δυναμεις αυτου. Crellius understands this clause as exegetical of the preceding. Φερειν hoc loco nihil aliud est quam movere, agitare. Dr. Newcome explains it, bearing before him, as the Greek word is used in the phrase αγειν και φερειν παντα. Αυτου undoubtedly refers to God; the author uses εαυτου in the next clause, where he means to speak of Jesus himself. See Pierce. 'Verbum potentiæ per hebraismum est verbum potens.' Crellius, q. d. ordering all things in the new dispensation by authority from God."

Belsham.

" *Who, being a ray of his brightness, and an image of his perfections, and ruling * all things by his powerful word, when he had by himself made a cleansing of our sins, sat down on the right-hand of the Majesty on high.*"—Unitarian Version.

" * *Ruling, &c.*—Ruling and directing all things in the new dispensation, by authority derived from the Father."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

HEBREWS i. 4.

(UNITARIANISM.)

*“ Being become so much greater than those Messengers *.”*

Belsham's Translation.

*“ * Those messengers—*And again ver. 5, unto which of those messengers. See Sykes. των αγγελων; those messengers, viz. οι προφηται, ver. 1. This interpretation, suggested many years ago by an ingenious friend, is adopted by Mr. Wakefield in his new translation. It is surprising that it was never thought of before.

“ But the Gentile Christians, from the beginning, misunderstood the expressions; and the original error seems to have been propagated from age to age almost without intermission.

“ The Hebrew Christian must, however, have understood the writer in the true sense; for it is evident, that they were always strictly Unitarian.”

See Dr. Priestly's History of Early Opinions, vol. iii. book iii. cap. 8. 12

HEBREWS i. 6.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ And let all the messengers of God pay homage to him,”

Unitarian Version.

“ i.e. Let all the prophets and messengers of God acknowledge him as their superior. ‘ Let the angels of God worship him.’ Newcome;—cited from Deut. xxxii. 43. LXX. where it is spoken of the Hebrew

nation, and, therefore, cannot be understood of religious worship. See Sykes on Heb. i. 6."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

HEBREWS i. 8.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"*But of the Son it saith, God is thy throne for ever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom is a straight sceptre.*"

Wakefield's Translation.

"In justification of this, see my *History of Opinions*, p. 274."

Wakefield.

"*But to the Son he saith, God is thy throne for ever and ever.*"

Unitarian Version, so also Lindsey.

"*God is the support of thy throne.*"—Sykes.

See Unitarian Version.

HEBREWS i. 13, 14.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"*Moreover to which of those messengers hath he ever said, sit thou at my right-hand until I make thy enemies thy footstool? Are they not all servants swift as winds, sent forth upon their ministry for the sake of those who were to be the heirs of salvation?*"—Belsham's Translation.

"*Are they not all servants?*"—Unitarian Version.

"The word spirit is a Hebraism to express a person's self, ver. 9.; 1 Cor. ii. 11. The spirit of a man is a man—is a man himself: the spirit of God is God."

himself. 2 Tim. iv. 22. The Lord Jesus Christ be with thy spirit, i. e. with thee. Here the former prophets are called ministering spirits, i. e. they were ministers or servants, whereas Christ appeared under the character of a Son."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

HEBREWS ii. 2.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"Spoken by messengers."—Unitarian Version.

"i. e. By former prophets and teachers, in contradistinction to the Messiah, who is called a Son, and appointed a Ruler."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

HEBREWS ii. 5.

"Unto Angels."

(UNITARIANISM.)

*"Angels—*So Belsham and Wakefield. Here the connexion requires, that the word which in the preceding section means human beings, messengers of God, should now be taken in the sense of celestial spirits, such as angels are supposed to be. This change in the signification of a word, without giving notice of it, though a great fault in composition is not out of character in our author, who writes rhetorically rather than logically, and often takes the liberty of playing upon his words. In ver. 7, of the first chapter, he uses the words in a sense totally different from their original meaning, as they stand

in the 104th Psalm. And if the common interpretation be correct, he changes the sense of *πνευμα*, in ver. 14, from the sense in which he uses it ver. 7, without giving any notice of the alteration. It is not often that a writer sets himself to prove, that a human being is a human being, and nothing more than a human being. But this writer, as though he were aware that the lofty expressions which he had used were liable to be misunderstood, endeavours to guard his readers against that misconception, by stating, in the most explicit terms, that by all he had said concerning the dignity of the founder of the new covenant, and his superiority to the angels, or prophets of the old dispensation, he never intended to represent him as superior to angels ; so, in fact, it was indispensably requisite to the accomplishment of the object of his mission, that he should be a proper human being, in every respect, similar to those whom he came to redeem from vice and misery, and not only so, but that he should also be a sufferer and a victim, previously to his advancement to his kingdom and glory. Such were the pains which the sacred writers took, and this writer in particular, to impress upon their readers a correct judgment concerning the person of their Master, and to prevent their figurative expressions from being misunderstood. Yet such was the shame and scandal of the cross, and the dread of being exposed to scorn as the disciples of the crucified Nazarene, that in the very age of the Apostles, and in defiance of the plainest language of the New Testament, men began to introduce those corrupt opinions concerning Christ, which gradually grew up to the deification of his person, and ultimately to the monstrous doctrine of a triune God, which, for fifteen cen-

turies, has been the belief and the disgrace of the Apostate Church."

Belsham.

"*To Angels*—It is no objection, that he uses the word Angel in a different sense, without giving notice of the change.

"This incorrectness of style is not uncommon in the sacred writers; and the author has before availed himself of the ambiguity of the word Angel, chap. i. 7. For the use of γὰρ as a connecting and not an illative particle, see Matt. i. 18.; James i. 7.; Heb. ii. 8."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

HEBREWS ii. 12.

"In the midst of the church will I sing praise."

No. 1.

(JUMPERS.)

The origin of Jumpers was as follows :

When Wesley went into Wales, he found a few Welsh clergymen who entered into his views with honest ardour, and an extravagance of a new kind grew up in their congregations. After the preaching was over, any one who pleased gave out a verse of a hymn ; and this they sang over and over again, with all their might and main, thirty or forty times, till some of them worked themselves into a kind of drunkenness or madness : they were then violently agitated, and leaped up and down, in all manner of postures, frequently for hours together. "At seven in the morning," says Whitefield, "have I seen per-

haps ten thousand from different parts, in the midst of a sermon, crying Gogunniant bendyitti, ready to leap for joy."

See Southey's Life of Wesley.

This singular practice of jumping began, it is said, among the Calvinistic Methodists, the followers of Howell, Harris, Rowland, and others in the western part of Wales, about the year 1760. It was soon after defended by Mr. William Williams, (the Welsh poet, as he is sometimes called) in a pamphlet, which was patronised by the abettors of jumping in religious assemblies, but viewed by the sober and grave with disapprobation and contempt. However, the advocates of groaning and loud talking, as well as loud singing, repeating the same line or stanza over and over thirty or forty times, became, in the course of a few years, more numerous, and were found among some of the other denominations in the principality of Wales, and continue to the present day.

The jumping tendency, however, never existed, in any degree as far as I can learn, in those parts of South Wales, where the English language is spoken; and it is now said to prevail chiefly in Cardiganshire and North Wales.

Several of the more zealous itinerant preachers encouraged the people to cry out "Gogunniant," (the Welsh word for praise or glory,) amen, &c. &c. to put themselves in violent agitations; and, finally, to jump until they were quite exhausted, so as often to be obliged to fall down on the floor, or on the field, where this kind of worship was held. These scenes often continue for an hour, or hours together, and sometimes during half the night, after having pro-

duced the greatest confusion, and too often turned the solemnities of religion into the most extravagant clamours and gestures.

See Adam's Religious World.

No. 2. (DANCERS—FRENCH CONVULSIONISTS.)

The Jumpers seem to have a near alliance with the sect of Dancers, who sprang up about the year 1373, and spread themselves in Flanders and places about. It was their custom all of a sudden to fall a dancing; and holding each others' hands, to continue thereat, till being suffocated with the extraordinary violence, they fell down breathless together. During these intervals of vehement agitation, they pretended to be favoured with wonderful visions. Like the Whippers, they roved from place to place, begging their victuals, holding their secret assemblies, and treating the priesthood and worship of the church, with the utmost contempt. The scarce less fanatical clergy believed them possessed with the devil; and, by singing of hymns, and application of sacred fumigations of incense, pretended to cast him out.

The French Convulsionists, who were remarkable for the vehemence and variety of their agitations, greatly resembled these brethren and sister dancers*.

* See Baluzii Pontif. Avenion tom. i. p. 485. Ant. Matthæi Analecta vet. Ævi.

HEBREWS ii. 14.

“ The Devil.”

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ The devil, which is sometimes a personification of the principle of evil, is in this passage probably put for the accusing and condemning power, that is, the law; which accuses, convicts, and passes a sentence of condemnation upon all who are subject to its authority, and who break its commands, and might well fill the hearts of all who are amenable to its tribunal with dismay. It is the law, which thus possesses the power of death, and which being abolished by the death of Christ, all who believe in him are released from its condemning sentence, and emancipated from the fear of death.”

Belsham.

HEBREWS ii. 16.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ For truly he helpeth not Angels, but helpeth a race of Abraham.”
Wakefield's Translation.

*“ For it layeth not hold of Angels *, but it layeth hold of the posterity of Abraham.”*—Belsham's Translation.

“ * *It layeth not hold of angels.* i. e. the fear of death. This interpretation is advanced by the late Rev. John Palmer, of Macclesfield, and ingeniously and learnedly supported by him in the Theological Repository, vol. v. p. 161.”

Belsham.

HEBREWS ii. 17.

“ Like unto his brethren.”

No. 1.

(CARPOCRATES.)

Carpocrates, who lived in the second century, and in many respects adopted the sentiments of the Gnostics, was probably the first person pretending to Christianity, who asserted the simple humanity of Christ.

His followers were marked on the ear by way of distinction.

Euseb. Iræn. Epiph. Hær.

No. 2.

(PAUL OF SAMOSATA.)

Paul of Samosata, who lived in the third century, contended, that the Son and Holy Ghost exist in God, as the faculties of reason and activity in men; that Christ was born a mere man; but the reason of the Father descending into him, caused him to be called the Son of God, and did by him work miracles, and instruct the people. His followers were called Paulians, Paulinists, and Samosatenians.

Epiph. Hæres, 65. Hillar. de Synod. p. 136.

HEBREWS iv. 12.

“ The word of God.”

(QUAKERS.)

It is one of the peculiarities of the Quakers, never to mention the Scriptures under the title of “ the

Word of God," an expression so common among most Christians. This expression, say the Quakers, is applied to the Son of God and the Holy Spirit, and by applying it to the sacred writings, a misapplication of passages in them is frequently occasioned.

See Tuke.

HEBREWS iv. 14.

"Jesus the Son of God."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"So called, as appears from the explanation of the word in the New Testament, because he was the first who was raised from the dead to an immortal life, Rom. i. 4.; Col. i. 18."

Belsham.

HEBREWS iv. 15.

"Was in all points tempted like as we are."

(SOCINUS.)

Socinus held, that the Lordship and dominion ascribed to Christ, in the Scriptures, implied and authorized the worship of him by prayer.

He declared it to be his opinion, however, that praying or offering up divine worship to Christ, is not necessary to salvation. In his answer to Wujeck, he expresses himself in the following manner:

"The Christian, whose faith is so great, as to encourage him to make his address habitually and

directly to the Supreme Being, and who standeth not in need of the comfort that flows from the innovation of *Christ his brother*, who was '*tempted in all things like as he is*,' that Christian is not obliged to call upon the name of Jesus, by prayer or supplication."

According, therefore, to the opinion of Socinus, those who lay aside all regard to Christ as an intercessor, and address themselves *directly* to God *alone*, have a greater measure of faith than others.

Faust. Socin. Oper.

HEBREWS v. 1.

"Taken from among men."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"This implies, that Jesus was taken from among men, i. e. that he was properly a man, otherwise the parallel will not hold."

Belsham.

HEBREWS v. 4.

"Called of God as was Aaron."

(SEPARATISTS.)

In arguing with Wesley on the necessity of separating from the Church of England, the Separatists alleged, that the ministers themselves disclaimed that inward call to the ministry, which is at least as necessary as the outward; and they

were not clear whether it be lawful to attend the ministrations of those whom God has not sent to minister.

They thought also, that the doctrines actually taught by a great majority of the church ministers, were not only wrong, but fundamentally so, and subversive of the whole Gospel; therefore, they doubted whether it were lawful to bid them God speed, or to have any fellowship with them.

Southey's Life of Wesley.

HEBREWS v. 6.

"Thou art a Priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedec."

No. 1.

(THEODOTUS.)

Theodotus, called, by way of distinction, the Banker, who lived in the second century, not only regarded this passage as disproving the divinity of Christ, but as establishing the superiority of Melchisedec over Jesus.

The superiority of Melchisedec, and a denial of Christ's humanity, were the leading tenets of Theodotus and his disciples. They scrutinized those passages of Scripture which spoke of Melchisedec. They found that Moses represented him as the Priest of the Most High; that he had blessed Abraham; that St. Paul asserted, that Melchisedec was without father, without beginning of days, &c.

From these passages, Theodotus and his disciples concluded, that Melchisedec was not as the generality of men; but that he was superior to Jesus Christ, and the first Priest of the Eternal Priest-

hood, through whom we have access to God, and to whom we ought to pay our worship.

The disciples of Theodotus offered, therefore, their oblations and prayers in the name of Melchisedec, whom they regarded as the true mediator between God and men: who ought to bless us in like manner as he blessed Abraham.

Towards the end of the third century, Hierax partly adopted the errors of Theodotus, and asserted, that Melchisedec was the Holy Ghost.

Others have maintained, that Melchisedec was Christ himself.

Epiph. Hæres. 67. Hieracitarum.—Cuneus, Républ. des Hébreux, tom. i. l. iii. c. 3. Dict. des Hérésies Art. Melchisedéciens.

No. 2.

(HUTCHINSONIANS.)

That Melchisedec was an eminent type of Christ, there can be little doubt; but that he was actually the second person of the Trinity, in a human form, is a tenet of the Hutchinsonians, though not quite peculiar to them.

See a learned dissertation, attempting to prove this, in the first vol. of Mr. Holloway's "Originals."

HEBREWS vii. 1.

"Melchisedec."

(See Note on Rom. iv. 1.)

HEBREWS vii. 25.

(UNITARIANISM.)

*“ Whence he is able also to save completely all that come unto God through him, as he ever liveth to manage their concerns * for them.”—Wakefield’s Translation.*

*“ * To manage their concerns—εἰς τὸ ἐντυγχάνειν. See this idea otherwise expressed in ix. 24. See also Epicteti, sect. 40 ; but there is no need of authorities to establish this sense of the word.”*

Wakefield.

“ Since he ever liveth to interpose for them.”—Unitarian Version.

“ The word ἐντυγχάνω is of very general import. It signifies interposing in any way, either for or against another. It is applied to Christ only twice in the New Testament, here and Rom. viii. 34. There is no reason to limit the sense to intercession, or praying for or against another. ‘ The perpetual intercession of Christ, here noted,’ says Mr. Lindsey, (Seq. p. 88. Note), ‘ may, perhaps, be the continual operation and effect of his miracles and doctrine in the world, by which men are brought to believe in God by him, and to be saved.’ Perhaps it may mean, that Christ, in his exalted state, is exerting his powers in some unknown way for the benefit of his Church. This text gives no countenance to the custom of offering prayers to God through the intercession of Christ. The only remaining places in which the word ἐντυγχάνω occurs in the New Testament, are Acts xxvii. 24.; Rom. viii. 27.; xi. 2.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

HEBREWS vii. 27.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"This he did once for all."—Belsham's Translation.

“*τοῦτο γὰρ ἐποίησεν*—This text has greatly puzzled the commentators; and is, indeed, when rightly understood, a complete refutation of the popular doctrine of the atonement, viz. that Christ died to expiate, or make atonement, or other satisfaction, or appease the wrath of the Father for the sins, the moral offences of mankind. This he did once for all. What? The construction plainly requires that the antecedent should be, he offered sacrifice first for his own sins, and after that for those of the people. So Grotius: ‘*Videtur hic et supra dici, c. v. 3. Christus quoque obtulisse non sæpius quidem sed semel pro peccatis non populi tantum sed et suis.*’ So Crellius: ‘*Principaliter hic de oblatione pro ipsius pontificis peccatis agi, ex superioribus, ipsoque rationum contextu manifestum est.*’

“The plain interpretation is, that the sins of Christ were merely ceremonial, such as the High Priest was accustomed to expiate on the day of atonement, chap. ix. 7. Our Lord sprang out of Judáh, of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning the priesthood: ver. 14, he was, therefore, to the priesthood in an unconsecrated state; that is, ceremonially, a sinner. And as Aaron was consecrated to his priestly office by the blood of animal sacrifices, so Christ was consecrated to his nobler office by his own blood. In this sense he offered a sacrifice for his own sins. This way of representing the death of Christ, was adapted to conciliate the prejudices of the Hebrew Christians. Also, as the posterity of Aaron were successively removed by death, ver. 23,

successive Priests were consecrated by successive sacrifices. But Christ lives for ever a consecrated Priest, and has no successor. Further, Priests under the law were subject to infirmity, and might desecrate themselves by ceremonial pollution and inadvertent acts: ver. 28. It was necessary, therefore, that they should be reconsecrated by daily and by annual sacrifices; but Christ, being incapable of ceremonial desecration, his own sacrifice is sufficient. He is now perfect for ever. And let it be remarked, *in the very same sense* in which Christ offered a sacrifice for his own sins, in that very sense did he offer sacrifice for the sins of the people. There is no distinction. But the sins of Christ were not moral, but ceremonial. No sacrifices are appointed for moral offences, either under the old dispensation or the new; no atonement, no appeasing of divine wrath, no satisfaction to offended justice. But as Christ, by his one sacrifice, consecrated himself for ever, transferred himself from a ceremonially unholy, to a ceremonially holy state; so exactly in the same way those who believe the Gospel, are, by the sacrifice of Christ, made ceremonially pure. From sinners they become saints; they are transferred from the community of unbelievers and enemies, to that of believers who are reconciled to God; and from this holy community nothing can exclude them, but wilful apostacy, voluntary transgression; and for these no sacrifice is provided.

“What the writer means is this: that as Aaron and his sons were consecrated to the priestly office by sprinkling of the real blood of the animal victim, Lev. viii. 30.; so converts to the Gospel are consecrated to God by the figurative application of the

blood of Christ ; and he gives this view of the purpose of the death of Christ, merely to reconcile the minds of the Hebrews to a fact, to them the most mortifying that could possibly be conceived, the crucifixion of the Messiah."

Belsham.

HEBREWS viii. 4.

" He would not be a Priest."

" Dr. Sykes argues from this text, 1, ' That Jesus never did act as a priest on earth ; 2. That he did not offer himself as a sacrifice upon the cross ; for if he had, he must have acted as a priest ; 3. That the cross is not, nor can it be considered in any sense as an altar ; 4. That the oblation of himself upon earth, or the shedding his blood, was no part of his sacerdotal office ; for this was all done and over before his priesthood began.' "

Belsham.

HEBREWS viii. 11.

" And they shall not teach," &c.

Dr. Priestley had a very peculiar idea of the state of things which will take place in the Hebrew nation when these prophecies are fulfilled, " That in this new and future state of things, the forms of the ancient law will be resumed, and continue to the

end of time, is evident from the very particular description of the temple, and the service of it, in the book of Ezekiel. And that there will be no change of the priesthood, is evident from its being there declared, that it will be in the family of Zadoc, while the temporal sovereignty will be in the family of David; so that both the king and the priest will be according to the ancient constitution, and the business of sacrificing will be conducted by them as it had been before."



HEBREWS ix. 1.

"Ordinances."

No. 1.

In the fourth century, the prodigious number of rites and ceremonies which had been invented, called forth that well-known saying of Augustine, that "the yoke under which the Jews formerly groaned, was more tolerable than that imposed upon many Christians in his time."

Augustin. Epist. 119. ad Januarium.



No. 2.

(GREEK CHURCH.)

The ceremonies of the Greek Church are numerous and burthensome, and a great part of them continued upon the authority of oral tradition only.

See King's Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church.

HEBREWS ix. 10.

“ Divers washings.”

(QUAKERS.)

The Quakers class baptism among those “divers washings,” which were imposed for a time only.

(See Notes on Matt. xxviii. 19. iii. 11.)

HEBREWS ix. 14.

(UNITARIANISM.)

*“ How much more will the blood of Christ, who offered himself with a spotless mind * unto God, cleanse your conscience,” &c.*

Wakefield's Translation.

“ * *With a spotless mind*, δια πνευματος αμωμου, more literally, *spotless in his mind*, in contradistinction to the mere *bodies* of sacrifices under the law, spoken of in the former verse.

“ The Æthiopic version has no epithet to πνευματος ; Coptic and Vulgate, read αγιου for αιωνιου, which is not amiss : *offered himself, with a holy mind, a spotless victim unto God.*”

Wakefield.

“ How much more will the blood of Christ, who by the Holy Spirit offered himself spotless to God, purify your conscience from dead works.”—Belsham's Translation.

HEBREWS ix. 22.

“ Without shedding of blood is no remission.”

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ The tabernacle, the vessels of the service, and other inanimate things, are here represented as purified with blood; and of these it is said, that without shedding of blood there was no remission. In exact conformity to this, the priest is said, Lev. xvi. 18. 23, by sprinkling of blood to make atonement for the altar, and to reconcile the holy place; the altar and the tabernacle, as well as the priests and congregation, ver. 33.

“ Inanimate beings, are thus represented as sinners, which need remission, atonement, and reconciliation by the sprinkling of blood. The meaning is obvious. Previously to the lustration, they were in a profane and unholy state; by the application of that rite, they were set apart and dedicated to the service of God.

“ This explains the sense in which the word sinner often occurs in the New Testament, and also that in which the blood of Christ is said to cleanse from sin; for it is never said to atone for it. They are called sinners, who live neither under the Mosaic, nor under the Christian covenant, and who are therefore said to be in an unholy state, how excellent soever their moral character may be, and they are called saints or holy, who publicly profess the Christian religion, whatever be the imperfection of their moral characters, and these are purified by the blood of Christ, because his death ratified the new covenant; and his blood is in a figurative sense

said to be sprinkled upon believers, to separate them from the unbelieving world to the service and worship of God."

Belsham.

HEBREWS x. 19.

• (UNITARIANISM.)

"*Having therefore, brethren! full liberty to go into* the sanctuary, through the blood of Jesus†.*"—Wakefield's Translation.

"* *Liberty to go into.*—Though almost all the expositors interpret this of heaven, yet the connexion clearly shews, that it must signify the Christian covenant typified by the celestial tabernacle exhibited to Moses in the mount, in which Jesus, our High Priest, is represented as officiating."

Belsham.

"† *Blood of Jesus.*—i. e. the High Priest went into the most holy place, purified with the blood of the animal victim, so we, sprinkled with the blood of Christ, may enter into the heavenly sanctuary, i. e. the Christian covenant."

Belsham.

HEBREWS x. 38.

"*My soul shall have,*" &c.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"This is one instance, among innumerable others, to prove, that the *soul* does not signify a separate

五、

• ~~Page 2~~ 2 55

[illegible]

immaterial substance, but a person's self. No one will maintain that God has a separable soul."

Belsham.

HEBREWS xi. 4.

"*Abel.*"

(UNITARIANISM.)

"As to all the inferences which have been drawn from the story of Abel, concerning the divine appointment of animal sacrifices, the necessity of a propitiatory offering, Abel's faith in the atonement of Christ, and the like, they are, to the last degree, precarious, and seem to originate wholly in the fond partiality of men to their own mysterious and unscriptural notions, without the least foundation in the narrative."

Belsham.

HEBREWS xi. 5.

"*Enoch.*"

"The writer assumes the truth of the narration in the Book of Genesis, and, admitting the facts, his conclusions are just. Nevertheless, as the inspiration of the writer of that book is no where asserted, and as the sources of his information are of doubtful authority, I do not know that we are obliged to admit the truth of the facts without hesitation. In the present instance there is sufficient reason for suspending assent. When Jesus

was transfigured, Moses and Elijah appeared to him, and conversed with him. Had Enoch been translated as they probably were, it is reasonable to believe, that he also would have appeared with them. Upon this subject, however, we are not very competent to judge, and must be content to leave the history in the same obscurity as that in which we find it."

Belsham.

HEBREWS xi. 17.

"Offered up Isaac."

"I quite agree with Hallett, that God had as perfect a right to take away the life of Isaac as a victim upon the altar, as by a common disease, or any other means; also, that God had an unquestionable right to put the faith of his father to the severe trial of requiring him to officiate as Priest upon the occasion. I am also ready to admit, that Abraham, having clearly ascertained that it was a divine command, was not only perfectly innocent, but highly meritorious in his ready obedience to a precept so harsh and painful; and finally, that a case so extraordinary as this, would give no encouragement to human sacrifices, and could not reasonably be pleaded as a precedent for this purpose, and that it served in its peculiar circumstances as a memorable example of faith and submission to the will of God in this venerable patriarch. Still, however, it is an idea so improbable, so revolting, so unlike any thing and every thing in the divine character and dispensations, that a father should be requested to sacrifice his son upon the altar, that

notwithstanding the testimony of the Book of Genésis, appealed to as it is by the author of this Epistle, whose authority, however, is of little value, I must acknowledge, that I feel great doubt as to the reality of the fact. It is possible that the historian may only mean to relate a visionary scene; as it is generally allowed, that some scenes are such, which are described in the prophets as historic facts. Or, possibly, it may be a figurative way of representing, that the life of Isaac, the heir of the promise, had, by some means or other, been exposed to danger in a situation in which the father had shewn great fortitude and an unwavering confidence in the divine promise."

Belsham.

HEBREWS xi. 21.

No. 1.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

"Blessed each of the sons of Joseph, and adored the top of his rod."—Roman Catholic Version.

"The Apostle here follows the ancient Greek Bible of the seventy interpreters, (which translates in this manner, Gen. xlvii. 31.) and alleges this fact of Jacob, in paying a relative honour and veneration to the top of the rod or sceptre of Joseph, as to a figure of Christ's sceptre and kingdom, as an instance and argument of his faith. But Protestants, who are no friends to this relative honour, have corrupted the text, by translating it, '*he worshipped, leaning upon the top of his staff;*' as if this circumstance of leaning upon his staff were any argument

of Jacob's faith, or worthy the being thus particularly taken notice of by the Holy Ghost."

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

Mr. Butler, in his "Book of the Roman Catholic Church," cites the decree of the Council of Trent, upon images, &c.

"Although the images of Christ, the Virgin Mother of God, and the other saints, are to be kept and retained, particularly in churches, and due honour and veneration paid to them, yet we are not to believe, that there is any divinity or power in them, for which we respect them; or that anything is to be asked from them; or that trust is to be placed in them, as the heathens of old trusted in their idols.

"Open our Catechisms," says Mr. Butler, "you will find it asked, 'May we pray to relics or images?' You will find it answered, 'No, by no means; for they have no life or sense to hear or help us.' Then open 'Gother's Papist Misrepresented,' you will read, 'Cursed is he that commits idolatry, that prays to images or relics, or worships them for God.'

"Such is the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church on those subjects.

"We venerate the cross, as a memorial of the passion and death of the Author of our salvation.

"We venerate the images, paintings, and relics of the saints, as memorials, that bring their virtues and rewards to our minds and hearts. We also venerate their relics, as portions of their holy bodies, which will be glorified through all eternity."

Butler's Book of the Roman Catholic Church.

No. 2.

(RELICS.)

“ At one time,” says Dr. Southey, “ relics, or entire bodies, used to be carried about the country, and exhibited to the credulous multitude; but this practice gave occasion to such scandalous impostures, that it was at length suppressed. The bodies of their saints are even now exposed in the Roman Catholic Churches: some dried and shrivelled, others reduced to a skeleton, clothed either in religious habits, or in the most gorgeous garments; a spectacle as ghastly as the superstition itself is degrading! The poor fragments of mortality—a skull, a bone or the fragments of a bone, a tooth, or a tongue, were either mounted or set, according to the size, in gold and silver, deposited in costliest shrines of the finest workmanship, and enriched with the most precious gems. Churches soon began to vie with each other in the number and variety of those imaginary treasures, which were sources of real wealth to their possessors.”

Southey's Book of the Church.

No. 3.

(ICONODULI.—ICONOMACHI.)

In the great controversy in the eighth century, respecting the worshipping of images, those who advocated this custom were denominated Iconoduli or Iconolatræ, and their adversaries were distinguished by the titles of Iconomachi and Iconoclastæ.

No. 4.

(GREEK CHURCH.)

Though the members of the Greek Church at the present day abhor the use of carved or graven images, and charge the Latins with idolatry on that

account, they, notwithstanding, admit into their houses and churches the picture of our Saviour, the Virgin Mary, and a whole multitude of saints, to instruct, they say, the ignorant, and to animate the devotions of others. These pictures are usually suspended on the partition or screen that separates the chancel from the body of the church, which from them receives the name of Iconostos; and they honour them by bowing, kissing them, and offering up their devotions before them. They likewise sometimes perfume them with incense. Upon some of their great festivals, they expose to view, on a table, in the middle of the choir, the pictures of the saint whom they commemorate, bowing as they approach, and kissing it with the greatest reverence: and Mr. Tournefort observes, that their devotion to the saints, and particularly to the blessed Virgin, comes but little short of idolatry. Yet they are far from thinking that they are thus guilty of any breach of the second commandment, which, according to them, prohibits only the making of graven images, and the worshipping of such idols as the Gentiles believed to be gods; whereas their pictures, being used merely as remembrances of Christ and the saints, have written on each of them the name of the saint whom it is meant to represent. But in their arguments in defence of this preference of painting to sculpture, there appears to be little solidity. They, however, consider themselves as secure, under the authority of St. John Damascenus, Nicephorus, &c.

Adam's Religious World.

HEBREWS xi. 29.

“ By faith they passed through the Red Sea.”

Dr. Geddes, and some of the German commentators contend, that Moses, having acquired a knowledge of the situation of the sands, during his long residence in the wilderness, took advantage of the ebb tide to conduct the Israelites over the sands, where Pharaoh and his host, for want of information, perished.

HEBREWS xi. 40.

“ God having provided some better thing.”

It is a strange conceit of Mr. Hallett's, that “good men, under the Mosaic dispensation, continued after death in a state of insensibility till the coming of Christ; but that all good Christians, when they die, enter immediately upon a state of activity and happiness, and that this is *the better thing provided for us.*”

HEBREWS xii. 22.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ And to myriads of messengers.”—Unitarian Version.

“As the writer is evidently describing the Christian Church and dispensation, as contrasted with the Mosaic, the connection requires that the word angels should be understood as in chap i. of prophets and messengers from God. And the writer

may well be supposed to allude to the abundant effusion of the Holy Spirit in the Apostolic age, by which multitudes were divinely qualified, as messengers from God, to teach and to confirm the doctrine of the Gospel."

Note to the Unitarian Version.



HEBREWS xii. 24.

"Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant."

(ANTINOMIANS.)

The Antinomians believe that the new covenant is not made properly with us, but with Christ for us; and that this covenant is all of it a promise, having no condition for us to perform; for faith, repentance, and obedience, are not conditions on our part, but Christ's, and that he repented, believed, and obeyed for us.

Gregory's Hist. &c.



HEBREWS xiii. 4.

"Marriage."

No. 1.

Archbishop Whitgift wrote to Queen Elizabeth, complaining that the commons had "passed a bill, giving liberty to marry at all times of the year without restraint, contrary to the old canons continually observed among us."

No. 2.

(DIRECTORY, PURITANS.)

The Directory for the public worship of God, ratified by the parliament, 1645, forbade the use of the ring in marriage.

The Puritans made particular objection to those words used in the marriage service, "with my body I thee worship."

See Neal.

No. 3.

(COMMONWEALTH.)

(Commonwealth, 1653.) The solemnizing of matrimony had hitherto been engrossed by the clergy, but this convention considered it as an evil contract, and put it into the hands of the justices of the peace, by an ordinance, which says, "That after the 29th of September, 1653, all persons who shall agree to be married within the Commonwealth of England, shall deliver in their names, and places of abode, with the names of their parents, guardians, and overseers, to the registrar of the parish where each party lives, who shall publish the banns in the church or chapel three several Lord's Days, after the morning service; or else in the market-place, three several weeks successively, between the hours of eleven and two, of a market-day, if the party desire it. The registrar shall make out a certificate of the due performance of one or the other, at the request of the parties concerned, without which they shall not proceed to marriage; it is further enacted, that all persons intending to marry shall come before some justice of the peace, within the county, city, or town corporate, where publication has been made as

aforesaid, with their certificate, and with sufficient proof of the consent of the parents, if either party be under age, and then the marriage shall proceed in this manner.

“ The man to be married shall take the woman by the hand, and distinctly pronounce these words. I, A. B. do here, in the presence of God, the searcher of all hearts, take thee, C. D. for my wedded wife, and do also, in the presence of God, and before these witnesses, promise to be to thee a loving and faithful husband.

“ Then the woman, taking the man by the hand, shall plainly and distinctly pronounce these words. I, C. D. do here, in the presence of God, the searcher of all hearts, take thee, A. B. for my wedded husband, and do also, in the presence of God and these witnesses, promise to be to thee a loving, faithful, and obedient wife.

“ After this, the justice may and shall declare the said man and woman to be from henceforth husband and wife, and from and after such consent, so expressed, and such declaration made of the same, as the form of marriage, it shall be good and effectual in law; and no other marriage whatsoever within the Commonwealth of England, after the 29th of September, 1653, shall be held or accounted a marriage according to the law of England.”

This ordinance was confirmed by the Protector's parliament in the year 1656, except the clause, “ That no other marriage whatsoever, within the Commonwealth of England, shall be held or accounted a legal marriage.”

No. 4.

(MORAVIANS.)

The Moravians published the following accounts of their custom respecting matrimony.

“ We highly reverence marriage, as greatly conducive to the kingdom of Christ; but neither our young men nor women enter into it till they assuredly know that they are married to Christ. When any know it is the will of God that they should change their state, both the man and woman are placed some time with some married persons, who instruct them how to behave, so that their married life may be pleasing to God. Then their design is laid before the whole church, and after about fourteen days they are solemnly joined, though not otherwise habited than they are at other times. If they make any entertainment, they invite only a few intimate friends, by whose faithful admonition they may be better prepared to bear the cross, and fight the good fight of faith.”

This passage Wesley inserted in the second part of his journal, without any comment or further explanation.

Southey's Life of Wesley.



HEBREWS xiii. 10.

“ We have an altar.”

No. 1.

Ridley, Cranmer, Latimer, and the rest of the English Reformers, were unanimously of opinion, that the retaining altars would serve only to nourish in people's minds the superstitious opinion of a pro-

pitiatory mass, and would minister an occasion of offence and division among the godly. But some of the bishops refused to comply with the council's order; as Day, bishop of Chichester, and Heath, of Worcester; insisting on the Apostle's words to the Hebrews, "We have an altar;" and rather than comply, they suffered themselves to be deprived of their bishopricks for contumacy, October, 1551.

Neal's History of the Puritans.

(See Note on 1 Cor. x. 21.)

No. 2.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

"We make a reverence to the altar upon which mass is said, because it is the seat of these divine mysteries, and figure of *Christ*, who is not only our *Priest* and *Sacrifice*, but our Altar too, inasmuch as we offer up our prayers and sacrifices through him."

"Upon the *altar* we always have a *crucifix*, that, as the mass is said in *remembrance* of Christ's passion and death, both priest and people may have before their eyes, during this sacrifice, the image that puts them in mind of his passion and death. And there are always lighted candles upon the altar during mass; as well to honour the victory and triumph of our great king (which is there celebrated) by these lights, which are tokens of our joy and of his glory, as to denote the light of faith, with which we are to approach to him."

See "the Garden of the Soul, or Manual of Spiritual Exercises and Instructions for the Roman Catholics."

No. 3.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“The Epistle to the Hebrews is the first of those books which are distinguished by Eusebius as having been disputed in the primitive ages of Christianity, and which, therefore, are not to be received as of equal authority with the rest. This Epistle, however, which contains many important observations, and many wholesome truths, mingled, indeed, with some far-fetched analogies and inaccurate reasonings, was probably written before the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, for it contains no allusion to those calamitous events. But by whom it was written is uncertain. Origen says that no one can tell who was the author of it. It has been ascribed to Paul, to Barnabas, to Luke, and to Timothy; but if Origen, the most learned and inquisitive writer in the third century, could not discover the author, it is in vain for us to attempt it, and we must be content to remain in ignorance.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

JAMES.

JAMES i. 1.

Luther rejected the Epistle of St. James as inconsistent with the doctrine of St. Paul, in relation to justification; he also set aside the Apocalypse; both of which are now received as canonical in the Lutheran Church.

See Mosheim and Encyc. Britann.

JAMES ii. 19.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“Thou believest that God is One—thou doest well; the demons also believe and tremble.”—Unitarian Version.*

“ The demons—Human ghosts. Mr. Farmer supposes an allusion to Job xxvi. 5, which he renders, ‘the giants, or the ghosts of the dead, tremble under the waters together with their hosts.’ He adds, ‘that St. James doth not appear to be delivering any new doctrine concerning demons, but rather to be arguing with the persons to whom he writes it,*

on their own principles. Farmer on Demoniacs, p. 211—216. First edition."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

JAMES ii. 24.

"Works."

(PELAGIUS.)

Pelagius contended, that good works were not merely meritorious, but the *only condition* of salvation.

JAMES v. 12.

"Swear not."

No. 1.

(LAMPETIANS.)

The Lampetians asserted, that man ought to perform no action against his free agency, whence all vows were undoubtedly unlawful; in all other respects, this sect professed the doctrines of Arianism.

Gregory's Hist. &c.

No. 2.

(APOSTOLICS.)

The Apostolics, (so called from their professing to exhibit in their lives and manners the piety and virtues of the holy Apostles), were a sect of the twelfth century. The chief of their peculiarities was, "holding it unlawful to take an oath."

St. Bernardus, Sermo 65, in Canticum, tom. iv.

No. 3.

(QUAKERS.)

This passage is also frequently quoted by the Quakers, as one upon which their practice of declining to take an oath upon any occasion whatever is founded.

Mr. Gurney observes, "that the Greek particle is capable of being rendered 'not even,' as well as 'nor.' Compare Mark iii. 20."

"Graviter falluntur qui solam a Christo improbari putant consuetudinem jurandi per res alias extra Deum; nam Jacobus, optimus Christi Interpres, ait 'non jurandum, neque per cœlum, neque per terram, neque alia quavis jurandi formula.'

"Imo sensus Christi est, non jurandum; ne quidem per cœlum, per terram, per Hierosolyma, per caput; quod ostendit membrum oppositum, 'sit autem sermo vester, est, est, non, non.' Grotius."

(See Note on Matt. v. 33.)

JAMES v. 14, 15.

No. 1.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

"Is any sick among you? let him bring in the Priests of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil."

Roman Catholic Version.

The sacrament of extreme unction, to which so much importance is attached by the Church of Rome, derives its origin from these words of St. James.

No. 2.

(GREEK CHURCH.)

In the Greek Church the sacrament of the holy oil, or euchelaion, is not confined to persons at the point of death, or dangerously ill, like the extreme unction of the Church of Rome, but is administered, if required, to devout persons upon the slightest malady. This ceremony, or mystery, as they are pleased to call it, is not deemed necessary to salvation; and it is well that it is not; for seven Priests are required to administer it regularly, and it cannot be administered at all by fewer than three. This oil may be consecrated by a Priest; and when consecrated, each Priest, in his turn, takes a twig, and dipping it in the oil, now made holy, anoints the sick person crosswise on the forehead, on the nostrils, on the paps, the mouth, the breast, and both sides of the hands, praying that he may be delivered from the bodily infirmity under which he labours, and be raised up by the grace of Jesus Christ.

This service the Latins consider the same as equivalent to extreme unction; but though the Greek Church reckons it in the number of her mysteries or sacraments, it differs from the Roman sacrament in its not being confined to persons periculose egrotantibus et mortis periculo imminente, and in its adhering more closely to the text on which it is founded, by requiring more Priests than one to administer it.

See la Doctrine Orthodoxe, &c. ou la Theologie Chretienne Abregée, par le très Rev. Père Platon (Metropolitan of Moscow,) p. 147.

The ointment for the holy chrism can be consecrated only by a Bishop, and that only once a year, on Thursday in Passion week. The preparation and

consecration of it is likewise confined in Russia to two places; to Moscow for Great Russia, and to Kieff for Little Russia, whence it is distributed to the several churches in each country.

At Moscow, there is a College of the Holy Synod, near the Cathedral Church, on purpose for this preparation, where the vessels and all proper utensils are kept.

See a list of the different ingredients in the composition, which are upwards of twenty, together with the order of preparing it, in Dr. King's Rites and Ceremonies, p. 419, &c.

No. 3.

(ТНН НОСТ.)

The ceremony of carrying the Host in procession, to communicate with the sick, appears to have arisen in England at the end of the twelfth century.

Hubert, Archbishop of Canterbury and Legate of Pope Celestine, held a Synod at York, in which he commanded, that when any sick persons were to receive the communion, the Priest should, himself, carry the Host, clothed with his proper garment, and with lights borne before him, suitable to so great a solemnity.

Dr. Jortin ascribes the origin of this ceremony, to the above-mentioned Legate at Cologne, who ordered, that when the sacrament was carried to the sick, the scholar and ringer should go before the Priest, and order the people to worship Jesus Christ in the streets and houses.

See Jortin.

JAMES v. 16.

"Confess your faults one to another."

No. 1. (ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

"That is, to the Priests of the Church, whom, ver. 14, he had ordered to be called for, and brought in to the sick."

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

No. 2. (AURICULAR CONFESSION.)

Innocent the Third had the credit of establishing by his own authority, among the duties prescribed by the divine laws, that of *auricular confession* to a Priest—a confession which implied not only a general acknowledgment, but also a particular enumeration of the sins and follies of the penitent.

Mosheim.

No. 3. (WESLEY.)

"In compliance with the desire of several persons," said Mr. Wesley, "I divided them into small companies; putting married or single men and married or single women together.

"The chief rules of these bands run thus:

"In order to *confess our faults one to another, and pray one for another that we may be healed*, we intend,

"1. To meet once a week at the least.

“ 2. To come punctually at the hour appointed.

“ 3. To begin with singing or prayer.

“ 4. To speak each of us in order, freely and plainly, the true state of our soul, with the faults we have committed in thought, word, or deed, and the temptations we have felt since our last meeting.

“ 5. To desire some person among us (thence called a leader,) to speak his own state first, and then to ask the rest in order, as many, and as searching questions as may be, concerning their state, sins, and temptations.

“ That their design in meeting might be the more effectually answered, I desired all the *men-bands* to meet me together every Wednesday evening, and the *women* on Sunday, that they might receive such particular instructions, as from time to time, might appear to be most needful for them.”

Wesley's Letter to the Rev. M. Perronet.

FIRST PETER.

1 PETER i. 5.

(PAULICIANS.)

The Paulicians, or Paulians, probably a branch of the Manichæans, received all the books of the New Testament, except the two epistles of St. Peter, which they rejected for reasons at present unknown.

Photius contra Manichæos. Petri Siculi Historia Manichæorum.

1 PETER i. 11.

“ The Spirit of Christ.”

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ i. e. The Spirit which prophesied concerning Christ. See Lindsey’s Seq. p. 281. The Spirit of an anointed one or Prophet.—Simpson.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

1 PETER i. 18.

“Not redeemed with corruptible things.”

(UNITARIANISM.)

“i. e. delivered from your former state of heathenism, prejudice, and vice, by the Gospel, which was ratified by the blood of Christ.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

1 PETER iii. 3, 4.

“Whose adorning, let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel,” &c.

(QUAKERS.)

The religious laws adopted by the Quakers not only enact a particular simplicity of dress, for the females as well as the males, but prohibit the former from wearing ornaments, curling the hair, &c.

1 PETER iii. 18.

“For Christ also hath once suffered for sins.”

(UNITARIANISM.)

“Christ suffered for sin, not by bearing the punishment due to sin, but to introduce and ratify a dispensation by which the idolatrous heathen would be admitted into covenant with God. See Heb. vii. 27, and the note there.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

1 PETER iii. 18.

“ Being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit.”

Cudworth observes, “ that this passage of Scripture, as it hath been interpreted by the generality of the ancient fathers, would naturally imply, even the soul of our Saviour Christ himself, after his death, and before his resurrection, not to have been quite naked from all body, but to have had a certain subtile or spirituous clothing, and it is this of Saint Peter, *Θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ, ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ τῷ πνεύματι, ἐν ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασι πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξε.*

“ Which being understood by those ancients, of our Saviour Christ descending into Hades or Hell, is accordingly thus rendered in the vulgar Latin, ‘ Put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the Spirit.’ In which (Spirit) also, he went and preached, to those spirits that were in prison, &c. So that the word *πνεύματι* or spirit here, according to this interpretation is to be taken, for a spirituous body; the sense being thus: that when our Saviour Christ was put to death in the flesh, or the fleshly body, he was quickened in the Spirit, or a spirituous body. In which (spirituous body) also, he went and preached to those spirits that were in prison, &c. And doubtless it would be said, by the asserters of this interpretation, that the word spirit could not here be taken for the soul of our Saviour Christ; because this being naturally immortal, could not properly be said to be quickened, and made alive; nor could he, that is, our Saviour Christ’s soul, be so well said, to go in this Spirit neither, that is, in itself, the soul in the soul, to preach to the spirits in

prison. They would add also, that spirit here could not be taken for the divine Spirit neither, which was the efficient cause of the vivification of our Saviour's body at his resurrection; because then there would be no direct opposition, betwixt being put to death in the flesh, and quickened in the Spirit, unless they be taken both alike materially. As also the following verse is thus to be understood, that our Saviour Christ, went without Spirit, wherein he was quickened, when he was put to death in the flesh, and therein preached to the spirits in prison. By which spirits in prison also would be meant, not pure incorporeal substances, or naked souls, but souls clothed with subtile spirituous bodies; as that word may be often understood elsewhere in Scripture.

See Cudworth, p. 805.

1 PETER iii. 19.

"The spirits in prison."

No. 1.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

It is principally from this passage that the Roman Catholics derive the doctrine of purgatory, or "a middle state of souls, suffering for a time, on account of their sins."

(See Note on Matt. xii. 32. No. 3.)

No. 2.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"By which, after he was gone, he preached unto the spirits in prison."—Unitarian Version.

"i. e. By the Holy Spirit, which after his ascension (see ver. 22,) he communicated to his Apostles,

he preached to spirits, i. e. to persons in prison, to idolatrous heathen, the slaves of ignorance and vice: he thus proclaimed liberty to the captives; Isaiah xlii. 6, 7. xlix. 9. See Mr. Lindsey's Sequel, p. 285, 286."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

1 PETER iii. 20, 21.

"Not the putting away of the filth of the flesh," &c.

(QUAKERS.)

A member of the "Society of Friends" observes, that Peter, (who, he allows, had continued the practice of water-baptism,) changed his views, as his experience in the service of the Gospel increased; and argues, that this description is by no means applicable to water-baptism, which, as it was then administered by immersion, did put away the filth of the flesh.

Mr. Tuke observes, "that the better translation of ver. 20, δι' ὕδατος, would be, not *by*, but *from* or *through* the water."

(See Notes on Acts x. 47.; Matt. xxviii. 19.; Matt. iii. 11.)

1 PETER iv. 1.

"Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh."

(CERINTHUS.)

"Cerinthus was one of the earliest and most distinguished seceders from the church. (See Note on Rev. xx. 4.) He taught, that in order to destroy

his corrupted empire, the Supreme Being had commissioned one of his glorious Æons *, whose name was Christ, to descend upon earth, who entered into Jesus' body, which was crucified; but that Christ had not suffered, but ascended into heaven."

Mosheim.

* Æons.—The word αἰών, or Æon, is commonly used by the Greek writers, but in different senses. Its signification in the Gnostic system is not extremely evident, and several learned men have despaired of finding out its true meaning. Αἰών, or Æon, among the ancients, was used to signify the age of man, or the duration of human life. In after times it was employed by philosophers to express the duration of spiritual and invisible beings. These philosophers used the word χρόνος as the measure of corporeal and changing objects; and αἰών as the measure of such as were immutable and eternal. And as God is the chief of those immutable beings, which are spiritual, and consequently not to be perceived by our outward senses, his infinite and eternal duration was expressed by the term αἰών, or Æon, and that is the sense in which that word is now commonly understood. It was, however, afterwards attributed to other spiritual and invisible beings; and the oriental philosophers, who lived about the time of Christ's appearance upon earth, and made use of the Greek language, understood by it the duration of eternal and immutable things, the space, or period of time in which they exist. Nor did the variations through which this word passed end here; from expressing only the duration of beings, it was, by a metonymy, employed to signify the beings themselves. Thus the Supreme Being was called αἰών, or Æon, and the angels distinguished also by the title of æons. All this will lead us to the true meaning of that word amongst the Gnostics. They had formed to themselves the notion of an invisible and spiritual world, composed of entities, or virtues, proceeding from the Supreme Being, and succeeding each other at certain intervals of time, so as to form an eternal chain, of which our world was the terminating link; a notion of eternity very different from that of the Platonists, who represented it as stable, permanent, and void of succession. To the beings that formed this eternal chain, the Gnostics assigned a certain term of duration, and a certain sphere of action. Their terms of duration were at first called αἰῶνες, and they themselves were afterwards metonymically distinguished by that title.—*MacLaine's note.*

No. 2.

(XENAIAS)

Xenaias of Hierapolis, in opposition to the tenets of Julian, from which it was supposed to follow, that Christ did not suffer in *reality*, but only in *appearance*, maintained, that Christ had indeed truly suffered the various sensations to which humanity is exposed, but that he suffered them not in his *nature*, but by a submissive act of his *will*.

Asseman Biblioth. Orient. Vatican, tom. ii.

SECOND PETER.

2 PETER i. 21.

“ For the prophesy came not in old time by the will of man : but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.”

(QUAKERS.)

The Quakers draw an analogy between the prophecy of the old and Gospel ministry of the present time, and conceive, therefore, that persons voluntarily undertaking that office, must speak *“ as they are moved by the Holy Ghost.”*

(See Note on Gal. i. 1.)

2 PETER ii. 4.

“ For if God spared not the angels that sinned.”

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ Or, if God spared not the messengers who had sinned, i. e. the spies who were sent to explore the

Land of Canaan, &c. see Simpson's Essays, p. 205, &c. But if the common interpretation be admitted, it will not establish the popular doctrine concerning fallen angels. For 1. The Epistle itself is of doubtful authority. 2. From the change of style, this is the most doubtful portion of the Epistle. 3. By those who admit the genuineness of the Epistle, this chapter is supposed to have been a quotation from some ancient apocryphal book, and the Apostle might not mean to give authority to the doctrine, but to argue with his readers upon known and allowed principles. See Sherlock's Discourses, and Benson and Doddridge's Introduction to this Epistle. The Epistle of Jude is supposed to allude to, or to quote from, the same apocryphal work."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

2 PETER iii. 5.

"By the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water."

"Aquam dixit Thales esse initium rerum," saith Cicero, "Deum autem eam mentem quæ ex aqua cuncta fingeret."

"Thales said the water was the first principle of all corporeal things, but that God was the mind which formed all things out of water;" for Thales was a Phœnician by extraction, and, accordingly, seemed to have received his two principles from thence; water, and the divine Spirit moving upon the water. The first whereof is thus expressed by Sanchoniathon, in his description of the Phœnician Theology

χάος θολερὸν ἐρεβώθεις, a turbid and dark chaos; and the second is intimated in these words *ἠρασθη το πνευμα των ιδιων αρχων*, *the Spirit was affected with love towards its own principles*, perhaps expressing the force of the Hebrew word *Merachepeth*, and both of them implying an understanding prolific goodness, forming and hatching the corporeal world into perfection; or else a plastic power subordinate to it. Zeno, who was also originally a Phœnician, tells us, that Hesiod's chaos was water, and that the material heaven, as well as earth, was made out of water, (according to the judgment of the best interpreters,) is the genuine sense of Scripture, 2 Peter iii. 5, by which water some, perhaps, would understand, a chaos of atoms confusedly moved.

Cudworth.

Porphyrus testifieth, that the ancient Pagans thought the water to be divinely inspired. "They thought that souls attended upon the water, or resorted thereunto, as being divinely inspired, as Numenius writeth, adding, the prophet also therefore to have said, that 'the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.' Gen. i. 2.

Cudworth, cap. iv. book i. p. 249.

2 PETER iii. 12.

"The heavens being on fire shall be dissolved."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"This, in a literal sense, is impossible, because the heavens are incombustible. Nor is it reasonable to believe, that an event so little countenanced by natural appearances as that of the destruction of the earth by a general conflagration, is the subject of divine prediction. It is well known, that in the language of prophecy, great political changes and revolutions are foretold under the symbol of terrible convulsions in the natural world. In this language, our Lord foretells the approaching desolation of Jerusalem. Matt. xxiv. 29. And in language precisely similar, borrowed indeed from the prophet Joel, the Apostle Peter himself, Acts ii. 31, describes the calamities of the Jewish nation, which were then impending. It can hardly admit of a doubt, that the sublime language of this context is to be interpreted in a similar manner. The 13th verse is a quotation from Isaiah lxxv. 17, where the new heavens and the new earth are universally understood to signify the Gospel dispensation. Consequently, 'the heavens and the earth which are now,' ver. 7, must necessarily signify the Jewish dispensation or the then moral state of the world, which must pass away to make room for the promulgation of the Christian religion. But this revolution cannot take place without producing great changes and convulsions in the political world, which, in prophetic language, is expressed by the heavens being on fire,

the elements melting, and the earth, with the works on it, being burned up."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

2 PETER iii. 16.

"In which are some things hard to be understood."

No. 1.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

The Roman Catholics conceive themselves warranted by these words, to deny the free use of the Scriptures to the Laity.

No. 2.

(MYSTICS.)

In the thirteenth century, when ignorance and superstition held almost unlimited sway, most of the Expositors, but chiefly the Mystics, extracted, according to their own blind imaginations, what they called *the hidden juice or marrow of Scripture*.

Brown.

and how the life of the world was made manifest to us, and we saw it and bear testimony, and declare unto you this eternal life, which was with the Father, and shewed itself unto us,) what we saw and heard we declare unto you, that ye also," &c.—Wakefield's Translation.

FIRST JOHN.

(UNITARIANISM.)

1 JOHN i. 1, 2, 3.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"What was at first, what we heard, what we saw with our eyes, what we observed, and our hands handled, concerning the doctrine of life (for this life shewed itself, and we saw it and bear testimony, and declare unto you this eternal life, which was with the Father, and shewed itself unto us,) what we saw and heard we declare unto you, that ye also," &c.—Wakefield's Translation.

"Concerning the word of life, him, who was from the beginning†, whom we have heard, whom we have seen with our eyes, whom we have looked upon and our hands have handled, (for the life ‡ was manifested, and we have seen and bear witness, and declare unto you that everlasting life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us:) him whom we have seen and heard, we declare unto you," &c.—Unitarian Version.*

"This version of the three first verses of this chapter was proposed by Theophilus Lindsey, in his second address to the students at Oxford and Cambridge, p. 302."

"* *The word of life*, i. e. Jesus Christ, who is called the Word, Luke i. 2. John i. 1, and the Word

of God, Rev. xix. 13. He was the divinely inspired teacher of the doctrine of a future life. The attentive reader will observe the resemblance between the introduction to the epistle, and that to the Gospel of John, which mutually illustrate and explain each other, and are a presumptive proof that both were written by the same author."

"† *From the beginning.*—Not from the beginning of time, but from the beginning of our Saviour's ministry. Lindsey. See John ii. 2, and the Notes there."

"‡ *Life.*—Life, and in the next clause, everlasting life, Christ is so called as the great teacher of everlasting life."

Notes to the Unitarian Version.

1 JOHN i. 7.

"*The blood.*"

(UNITARIANISM.)

"i. e. The doctrine of Jesus confirmed by his death. See John vi. 53. 56."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

culties of my soul after Christ, which continued three or four nights and days. It was a mighty rushing wind coming into the soul, enabling me from that moment to be more than conqueror over those corruptions to which before I was always a slave. Since that time the whole bent of my will hath been towards him day and night, even in my dreams. I know that I dwell in Christ, and Christ in me: I am bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh."

Wesley.

1 JOHN iv. 9.

"Only-begotten."

(See Note on John i. 14.)

1 JOHN v. 6.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"This is he, who came by water, and blood, and breath, Jesus the Christ, not by water only, but by water and blood, and breath, is the testimony given."—Wakefield's Translation.

"In the addition of *the Spirit* to the first clauses, I follow the Coptic and Æthiopic versions; and, if any one shall think it worth his while to consult in my Evidences of Christianity, remark 36, what I apprehend to be an indisputably just explanation, he will be convinced of the necessity of this disposition of the passage, and will see a beauty in the reasoning of the Apostle, which he never before observed. Upon this I follow the Æthiopic version in omitting the clause of the verse, which is

evidently impertinent. The expressions are harsh, and the construction embarrassed and indirect. He might have expressed himself better thus: '*This is Jesus who came and was proved to be the Christ by the water,*' &c."

Wakefield.

1 JOHN v. 7.

"*There are three that bear record in heaven.*"

No. 1. (TRITHEISTS.)

The Tritheists sprang up about the end of the sixth century. John Ascusuage was the chief of this sect. He imagined in the Deity three natures or substances, absolutely equal in all respects, and joined together by no common *essence*: to which opinion his adversaries gave the name of tritheism. The Tritheists divided into Philoponites and Cononites, according to the name of their respective leaders.

See Mosheim.

No. 2. (REALISTS—NOMINALISTS—FORMALISTS.)

A warm controversy subsisted in the eleventh century between the Realists and Nominalists. The former attacked the latter by the dangerous conclusions that seemed deducible from their principles; and reasoned thus: "If, as your doctrine supposes, *universal substances* are no more than mere *sounds* or *denominations*, and the whole science of logic is only conversant about words, it must of necessity follow,

culties of my soul after Christ, which continued three or four nights and days. It was a mighty rushing wind coming into the soul, enabling me from that moment to be more than conqueror over those corruptions to which before I was always a slave. Since that time the whole bent of my will hath been towards him day and night, even in my dreams. I know that I dwell in Christ, and Christ in me: I am bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh."

Wesley.

1 JOHN iv. 9.

"Only-begotten."

(See Note on John i. 14.)

1 JOHN v. 6.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"This is he, who came by water, and blood, and breath, Jesus the Christ, not by water only, but by water and blood, and breath, is the testimony given."—Wakefield's Translation.

"In the addition of *the Spirit* to the first clauses, I follow the Coptic and Æthiopic versions; and, if any one shall think it worth his while to consult in my Evidences of Christianity, remark 36, what I apprehend to be an indisputably just explanation, he will be convinced of the necessity of this disposition of the passage, and will see a beauty in the reasoning of the Apostle, which he never before observed. Upon this ground I follow the Æthiopic version in omitting also the last clause of the verse, which is

evidently impertinent. The expressions are harsh, and the construction embarrassed and indirect. He might have expressed himself better thus: '*This is Jesus who came and was proved to be the Christ by the water,*' &c."

Wakefield.

1 JOHN v. 7.

"*There are three that bear record in heaven.*"

No. 1. (TRITHEISTS.)

The Tritheists sprang up about the end of the sixth century. John Ascusuage was the chief of this sect. He imagined in the Deity three natures or substances, absolutely equal in all respects, and joined together by no common *essence*: to which opinion his adversaries gave the name of tritheism. The Tritheists divided into Philoponites and Cononites, according to the name of their respective leaders.

See Mosheim.

No. 2. (REALISTS—NOMINALISTS—FORMALISTS.)

A warm controversy subsisted in the eleventh century between the Realists and Nominalists. The former attacked the latter by the dangerous conclusions that seemed deducible from their principles; and reasoned thus: "If, as your doctrine supposes, *universal substances* are no more than mere *sounds* or *denominations*, and the whole science of logic is only conversant about words, it must of necessity follow,

that the three persons in the Godhead are only three *names*, and not three *realities*, or *things*." "We deny the conclusion," replied Roscellinus, "the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are not placed by us in the rank of *denominations*, but in the class of realities, or things." The subtle doctor here, as all must more or less do after him, by avoiding Scylla fell into Charybdis, and was charged by his adversaries with the introduction of Tritheism, by holding an opinion that supposed the existence of three divine substances. Were any of the writings of Roscellinus now extant, they would help us, no doubt, to form a juster notion of this controversy than we can have at present.

The Realists, who followed the doctrine of Aristotle with respect to *universal ideas*, were so called in opposition to the Nominalists, who embraced the hypothesis of Zeno and the Stoics upon that perplexed and intricate subject. Aristotle held, against Plato, that previous to, and independant on matter, there were no universal *ideas* or *essences*; and that the ideas or exemplars which the latter supposed to have existed in the divine mind, and to have been the *models* of all created things, had been eternally impressed upon matter, and were coeval with, and inherent in, their objects. Zeno and his followers, departing both from the Platonic and Aristotelian systems, maintained, that these pretended *universals* had neither *form* nor *essence*, and were no more than mere terms and nominal representations of particular objects. The doctrine of Aristotle prevailed until the eleventh century, when Roscellinus embraced the Stoical system, and founded the school of the Nominalists, whose sentiments were propagated with great success by the famous Abelard.

These two sects differed considerably among themselves, and explained, or rather obscured, their respective tenets in a variety of ways.

See Mosheim, and Maclaine's Note.

A sect, under the name of Formalists, pretended to terminate the contests between the Nominalists and Realists, by steering a middle course. See Jo. Sarisbur. Metalogic. lib. ii. cap. xvii. p. 814, where that eminent author describes at large the various contests of these three sects, and sums up their differences in the following words. "Alius consistit in vocibus, licet hæc opinio cum Roscellino suo fere jam evanuerit; alius sermones intuetur; alius versatur in intellectibus," &c.

See also Jo. Sarisburiensis Policrat, l. vii. p. 451.

1 JOHN v. 7.

"These three are one."

No. 1.

Following the leading ideas of Sir William Jones, Mr. Maurice says, that there is a perpetual recurrence of sacred triad of Deity in the Asiatic mythology; and that the doctrine of a Trinity was promulgated in India, in the Geeta, 1500 years before the birth of Plato; for of that remote date are the elephantia cavern, and the Indian history of Mahabbarat, in which a triad of Deity is alluded to and designated. Hence he supposes, that the doctrine of a Trinity was delivered from the ancient patriarchs;

and diffused over the East, by the migration and dispersion of their Hebrew posterity.

See Maurice's Dissertation on the Oriental Trinities.

No. 2.

The genuine Trinity of Plato and Parmenides is defined by Cudworth to be a middle betwixt that of Sabellius and that of Arius; it being neither a Trinity of words and names, as the former, nor a heteroousious Trinity, a confused jumble of God and creature together; but homousious and homogeneous; all eternal, necessarily existent, infinite or omnipotent, and Creator.

See Cudworth.

No. 3.

(DAMIANISTS.)

The Damianists, so called from Damian, bishop of Alexandria, in the sixth century, distinguished the *divine essence* from the Three Persons, viz. the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. They denied that each person was God, when considered in itself, and abstractedly from the other two; but they affirmed, at the same time, that there was a common divinity, by the joint participation of which each was God. They therefore called the Godhead, which was common to them all, substance or nature.

J. S. Asseman Biblioth. Orient. Vatican, v. ii. p. 78. 332.

No. 4.

In the eighth century, the Irish divines made use of a certain syllogism, to demonstrate that the pers

sons in the Godhead were *substances*. “Apud modernos scholasticos, maxime apud Scotos, est syllogismus delusionis, ut dicant Trinitatem, sicut personarum, ita esse substantiarum; quatenus si adsenserit illectus auditor, Trinitatem esse trium substantiarum Deum, trium derogetur cultor Deorum; si autem abnuerit, personarum denegator culpetur.”

Letter of Benedict, Abbot of Aniane, to Guarnanius.

No. 5.

(ABELARD.)

Abelard says of the Trinity, “Les noms des trois personnes comprennent l’Etre souverainement parfait,—la puissance de Dieu est marquée par le nom de Père, la sagesse par celui de fils, et la charité de Dieu envers les hommes, par celui du Saint Esprit.” “The names of the Three Persons comprehend an entirely perfect Being. The power of God is marked by the name of Father; wisdom, by that of the Son; and the charity of God towards men, by that of the Holy Spirit.” He adds, that “he finds the mystery of the Trinity in the prophets and ancient philosophers.”

Abelard’s doctrine may be found in Thesaurus Anecdotorum of P. Martene. See also Bayle’s Dict. Art. Abelard.

No. 6.

(SWEDENBORGIAN.)

Though the Swedenborgians maintain that there is but one God, and one Divine Person, yet they hold that in this Person there is a real Trinity; consist-

ing of the divinity, the humanity, and the operation of them both in the Lord Jesus; a Trinity which did not exist from all eternity, but commenced at the incarnation.

See Burrowe's Encyclop.

No. 7.

(HUTCHINSON.)

Mr. Hutchinson * intimated, that the idea of the Trinity was to be taken from the grand agents in the natural system, *fire, light, and spirit*. His theory was as follows: "That the Hebrew Scriptures nowhere ascribe motion to the body of the sun, nor fixedness to the earth; that they describe the created system to be a plenum without any vacuum at all, and reject the assistance of gravitation, attraction, or any such occult qualities, for performing the stated operations of nature, which are carried on by the mechanism of the heavens, in their threefold condition of fire, light, and spirit or air, the material agents set to work at the beginning: that the heavens, thus framed by almighty wisdom, are an instituted emblem and visible substitute of Jehovah Aleim, the eternal Three, the co-equal and the co-adorable Trinity in Unity: that the unity of substance in the heavens points out the unity of essence, and the distinction of conditions, the personality in

* Mr. Hutchinson was born in 1674. His notions have made no inconsiderable noise in the world. Those who adopt his tenets are styled Hutchinsonians. The reader may find a distinct and comprehensive account of the Hutchinsonian system in a book entitled "Thoughts concerning Religion," &c. printed at Edinburgh, 1743, and in a letter to a Bishop annexed to it, first printed in 1732.

Deity, without confounding the persons or dividing the substance. And that from their being made emblems, they are called in Hebrew, Shemim, the names, representatives, or substitutes, expressing by their names, that they are emblems, and by their condition or offices, what it is they are emblems of."

No. 8.

(QUAKERS.)

Although the belief of the Quakers, with regard to the Trinity, corresponds with that of the Church of England, they object to the use of the word "Trinity," thinking it best, as they say, to confine themselves to Scriptural expressions.

No. 9.

(UNITARIANISM.)

Wakefield and the compilers of the Unitarian Version, entirely omit the 7th verse of this chapter.

"In the omission of the 7th verse, and of the words *αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ* of the eighth, I follow precisely the Syriac, Coptic, Æthiopic, and Arabic translations. The amount of this concurrent testimony may be seen in my Enquiry into the Opinions of Christian Writers, p. 141."

Wakefield.

"The received text reads, '*For there are three that bear record in heaven; the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one; and there are three that bear witness in earth.*'"

"N.B. 1. This text, concerning the heavenly witnesses, is not contained in any Greek manuscript

which was written earlier than the fifteenth century. 2. Nor in any Latin manuscript earlier than the ninth century. 3. It is not found in any of the ancient versions. 4. It is not cited in any of the Greek ecclesiastical writers, though, to prove the doctrine of the Trinity, they have cited the words both before and after this text. 5. It is not cited by any of the early Latin fathers, even when the subjects upon which they treat would naturally have led them to appeal to its authority. 6. It is cited by Vigilius Tapsensis, a Latin writer of no credit, in the latter end of the fifth century, and by him it is suspected to have been forged. 7. It has been omitted as spurious in many editions of the New Testament since the Reformation. In the two first of Erasmus, in those of Aldus, Colinaeus, Zuinglius, and lately of Griesbach. 8. It was omitted by Luther in his German version. In the old English Bibles of Henry VIII. Edward VI. and Elizabeth, it was printed in small types, or included in brackets; but between the years 1566 and 1580, it began to be printed as it now stands; by whose authority is not known. See Travis' Letters to Gibbon, and Porson's to Travis. Also Griesbach's excellent dissertation on the text at the end of his second volume. Archbishop Newcome omits the text, and the Bishop of Lincoln expresses his conviction that it is spurious; Elem. of Theol. vol. ii. p. 90. note."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

1 JOHN v. 16.

“There is a sin unto death.”

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

“Some understand this of final impenitence, or of dying in mortal sin; which is the only sin that can never be remitted. But it is possible he may also comprise under this name the sin of apostacy from the faith, and some other such heinous sins as are seldom and hardly remitted; and, therefore, he gives little encouragement to such as pray for these sinners, to expect to obtain what they ask.”

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

1 JOHN v. 20.

“This is the true God and eternal life.”

(UNITARIANISM.)

“‘q. d. By him that is true, I mean the true God, and giver of everlasting life; see John xii. 50; xvii. 3. Grot. and Whitby; Last Thoughts, second edit. p. 86. Or this is the true God, and this Jesus Christ is everlasting life, chap. i. 2. That οὗτος sometimes refers to the remote antecedent, see Acts ii. 22, 23.; viii. 18, 19; 2 John 7.’—Newcome’s Note.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

J U D E.

JUDE ver. 6.

"Angels which kept not," &c.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"Or 'the messengers who watched not daily over their own principality, but deserted their proper habitation, he kept with perpetual chains under darkness (punished them with judicial blindness of mind) unto the judgment of a great day, i. e. when they were destroyed by a plague,' alluding to the falsehood and punishment of spies, Numbers xiv. See Simpson's Essays, p. 210. This may be thought by some a far-fetched interpretation. Perhaps the writer may refer to some fanciful account of a fall of angels contained in the apocryphal books which lay before him, without meaning to vouch for the fact. He might introduce it merely to illustrate his argument. At any rate, a fact so important is not to be admitted upon such precarious evidence."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

REVELATION.

REVELATION ii. 1.

Mr. Evanson, who maintains the divine authority of the rest of the Apocalypse, rejects the epistles to the seven churches as spurious.

Dissonance, p. 284. 286.

REVELATION ii. 10.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“Behold the accuser,” &c.—Wakefield and Unitarian Version.

REVELATION ii. 24.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“The deep things of Satan.”—Unitarian Version.

“viz. The Mysteries of Gnosticism, which were hostile to the doctrine of Christ, and which were called by the Gnostics, ‘the deep things of God.’ See Wetstein.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

REVELATION ii. 26.

“ To him will I give power over the nations.”

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

“ See here how the saints deceased live with God, and have power given them over countries and nations.”

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

REVELATION iii. 20.

“ Behold I stand at the door, &c.—Will sup with him and he with me.”

(QUAKERS.)

It has been observed, in a note on Matthew iii. 11, that the Quakers do not observe either the sacrament of baptism or the Lord's supper. They argue, that the commandment to wash one another's feet (John xiii. 12—13,) is regarded by nearly every sect of Christians, as having been temporal and local; but that it is enforced in more direct terms than either baptism or the Lord's supper. They contend that “ retaining these ceremonies has, in general, a tendency to settle the minds of the professors of Christianity in unnecessary forms, and to prevent their aspiring sufficiently after the practice of real and vital Christianity. They advocate an inward communion, and spiritual participation of the Lord's supper.” They believe that the true Lord's supper requires no such elementary mediums as bread and wine for its participation; but that it

is the same, and the qualification to receive it the same, as is pointed out by this language to one of the churches. *'Behold I stand, &c. and will sup with him and he with me.'*

"We believe that the Apostle, in 1 Cor. xi. 20, saith true, where he saith, *'When ye come together therefore in one place, this is not to eat the Lord's supper.'* And all that he speaks in that chapter is, not to perpetuate that outward breaking of bread, otherwise than as the believers did, that were *'filled with the Holy Ghost in singleness of heart.'*"

See "*Declaration of our Faith who are called Quakers,*" A.D. 1668.

"It may be doubted," says Mr. Gurney, "whether this supper, as it was observed by the primitive Christians, could justly be considered as a direct ceremonial ordinance. But upon the supposition that the Apostles and their companions, like more modern Christians, were accustomed to practice it as a religious rite, and as a part of their system of divine worship, such an institution must be regarded as immediately connected with the Jewish passover. The lamb eaten at the passover, and the bread broken, and wine poured forth in the Christian eucharist, were equally intended as types, and they were types of the same event, the death and sacrifice of Christ. The two ceremonies, therefore, may be looked upon as the same in point of principle. But it is more especially to our present purpose to remark, that the breaking of the bread, and the pouring forth of the wine, together with the blessing, and giving of thanks, which distinguish the ceremony of the eucharist, actually formed a part of the ritual order to which the ancient Jews were accustomed, in celebrating the supper of the pass-

over. This fact is sufficiently evident, from the narrations contained in the gospels of our Lord's last paschal meal with his disciples, and is fully substantiated on the authority of the Rabbinical writers, who, in their minute statements respecting the right method of conducting that ceremonial Jewish supper, have explicitly directed the observance of these several particulars. See extracts from the Talmud and Maimonides in Lightfoot. Hor. Heb. in Matthew xxvi."

REVELATION v. 8.

"The prayers of saints."

No. 1.

(ROMAN CATHOLICS.)

"Here we see that the saints in heaven offer up to Christ the prayers of the faithful upon earth."

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

"*The saints*, reigning with Christ, offer up their prayers to God for man. It is a good and useful supplication to invoke them; and to have recourse to their prayers, help and assistance to obtain favours from God, through his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, above, who is our Redeemer and Saviour. This is the decree of the Council of Trent. Sess. 25. De invocatione Sanctorum. The catechism, published in pursuance of its decrees, teaches, that God and the saints are not to be prayed to in the same manner; for we pray to God that he himself would give us good things, and deliver us from evil things: but we beg of the saints, because they are

pleasing to God, that they would be our advocates, and obtain from God what we stand in need of.' Part iv. *Quis orandus.* Consult Bossuet's *Exposition of Faith.*

"Open our prayer-books," says Mr. Butler, "you will find, that when we address God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Ghost, or the Holy Trinity, we say to them, '*have mercy on us.*' And that when we address the blessed Virgin, the saints, or the angels, the descent is infinite; and we say to them, '*pray for us.*'"

"The Roman Catholic children, in their very first catechism, are asked the following questions, and give the following answers.

"Q. Does the second commandment forbid the making of images?

"A. It forbids the making of them so as to adore them; that is, it forbids making them our gods.

"Q. Does this commandment forbid all honour and veneration of the saints and angels?

"A. No; we are to honour them as God's special friends and servants, but not with the honour that belongs to God."

Mr. Butler observes, that "the catechisms for the adult express the same doctrine, but in stronger terms. Dr. Challoner's '*Summary of Christian Doctrine*' prefixed to '*the Garden of the Soul*,' the most popular prayer-book of the English Roman Catholics, lays down the same doctrine; and in '*the Papist Misrepresented and Represented*,' published by the Rev. Mr. Gother, our most eminent controversialist, in the seventeenth century, and often republished by Dr. Challoner, the following anathema is pronounced against the idolatrous worship of the saints: '*Cursed is he that believes the*

saints in heaven to be his Redeemers; that prays to them as such; or that gives God's honour to them, or to any creature whatsoever. Amen.'”

Butler's Book of the Roman Catholic Church.

No. 2.

In the ninth century, particularly, every church, and indeed every private Christian, had their particular patron among the saints; from an apprehension that their spiritual interests would be but indifferently conducted by those who were already employed respecting the souls of others. This notion rendered it necessary to multiply prodigiously the number of saints, and to create daily new patrons for the people.

The ecclesiastical councils found it necessary at length to set limits to the superstition of the populace, who, with a view to have still more friends in the celestial regions, (for such were their notions) were daily adding new saints to the list of their mediators. They accordingly declared, by a solemn decree, that no departed Christian should be considered as a member of the order of saints, before the Bishop, in a provincial council, and in presence of the people, had pronounced him worthy of that distinguished honour.

It was in the tenth century that the Roman Pontiff afforded the first specimen of his ghostly power; for, in the preceding ages, there is no example of his having alone exercised this privilege. This specimen was given in the year 993, by John XV. who, with all the formalities of a solemn canonization, enrolled Udalric, Bishop of Augsburg, in the number of the saints, and thus conferred upon

him a title to the veneration of Christians. There are several examples, however, upon record, which prove that this privilege was not solely vested as yet in the Roman Pontiff, since not only provincial councils, but also several of the first order among the Bishops, advanced to the rank of saints such as they thought worthy of that high dignity, and continued thus to augment the celestial patrons of the church, without even consulting the Roman Pontiff until the twelfth century; when Alexander III. abrogated the privilege of the Bishops and council, and placed canonization in the number of the more important acts of authority*, which the sovereign Pontiff alone, by a peculiar prerogative, was entitled to exercise.

See F. Pagi Breviar. Pontif. Roman. and Mabillon.

No. 3.

In the year 1550, Hooper was appointed Bishop of Gloucester, by letters from Edward VI. One of Hooper's reasons for declining, was the form of the oath, which he denominated impious.

By the oath, is meant the oath of supremacy, which was in this form,—by God, by the saints, and by the Holy Ghost; which Hooper thought impious, because God only ought to be appealed to in an oath, forasmuch as he only knows the thoughts of men.

The young king being convinced of this, struck out the words with his own pen.

Neal.

* These were called the *Causæ Majores*.

REVELATION v. 14.

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ And the four living creatures said Amen, and the elders fell down and worshipped.”—Unitarian Version.

“ This homage paid to a symbolical representation of Christ in a visionary scene by symbolical persons represented as visibly present with him, cannot justify the actual worship of Christ, when he is not visible, and in direct opposition to his own express precept, Luke xi. 1, 2; John iv. 23, 24. Least of all can it be concluded, as Mr. Lindsey well observes, (Seq. p. 96,) ‘ that equal honour and worship are to be given to Christ and to God, from their being thus joined in the same act of worship. Because, if so, it will follow, that equal honour and worship is to be given to David and to God; for it is expressly said, (1 Chron. xxix. 20,) that all the congregation bowed down their heads and worshipped the Lord and the king.’ ”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

REVELATION viii. 1, 2.

“ The seventh seal”—“ seven trumpets.”

(COCCEIUS.)

Cocceius, a native of Bremen, who lived in the seventeenth century, represented the whole history of the Old Testament as a mirror, that held forth an accurate view of the events that were to happen

in the Church under the dispensation of the New Testament, and unto the end of the world.

He divided the whole history of the Church into *seven periods*, conformable to the seven *trumpets* and *seals* mentioned in the Revelation.

See Val Alberti Διπλοῦν καπτα, Cartesianismus et Cocceianismus Descripti et Refutati. Lips. 1678.

REVELATION ix. 1.

“ *A star fall.* ”

“ *Some arch-heretic.* ”

Note to the Roman Catholic Version.

REVELATION xi. 7.

“ *The beast.* ”

Among the heresies of his time, Mr. Edwards mentions the following.

“ No. 143. That the Presbytery and Presbyterial government are the false prophet and beast spoken of in the Revelation. Presbytery is a third part of the city of Rome; yea, that beast in Rev. xi. that ascends, and shall kill the two witnesses, viz. the Independents.”

See Edwards' Gangræna, printed in 1646.

REVELATION xii. 7.

"There was war in heaven; Michael and his angels fought against the dragon."

No. 1.

(WALTER.)

Walter *, surnamed Lollard, is said to have asserted, among other strange things, that Lucifer and the other fallen angels were driven from heaven unjustly, and that the time would come when they would be re-established in heaven; when St. Michael and other angels guilty of this injustice, would be condemned to eternal punishment, with those who did not embrace the opinions of the Lollards.

Walter selected twelve men from his disciples, whom he denominated apostles. They traversed Germany every year to confirm those who adopted their sentiments. Walter was burnt at Cologne, A.D. 1322.

See Dictionn. des Hérésies.

No. 2.

In the reign of Justinian it became common to join the names of the Virgin Mary and the arch-angels Michael and Gabriel in common oaths.

Gregory's Hist. &c.

* The compiler of the *Dictionn. des Hérésies* asserts, that the followers of this Walter afterwards came to England and joined the Wickliffites. Dr. Mosheim denies the connection altogether, and says, that the Wickliffites were styled Lollards merely by way of reproach, that word being translated from the Flemish tongue into English, and applied to all heretics. See his third vol. pp. 334. 378.

No. 3.

We are told that in the superstitious ages a set of blinded persons imagined, that on every Monday mass was performed in heaven by St. Michael, in the presence of God; and consequently they resorted in crowds on that day to all the churches which were dedicated to that highly honoured saint.

*Ratherii Epist. Synodica in Dacherii Spicilegio Script. Vet. t. ii.
p. 294, Sigebertus Gemblac. Chronol. ad A. 939.*

REVELATION xiv. 1.

"A Lamb stood on the Mount Sion, and with him an hundred forty and four thousand, having his Father's name written in their foreheads."

(ZINZENDORF—HERRNHUTTER.)

If we may believe Count Zinzendorf, the founder, in the eighteenth century, of the Moravian sect called Herrnhutter, he was scarcely ten years of age, when, excited perhaps by the fame of the leading pietists in Germany, he began to form a design of gathering a society of believers, with whom he might spend his days in the exercises of devotion. In 1721 he applied himself to the execution of his project, and settling at Berthelsdorf, in Upper Lusatia, where he had purchased an estate, he was joined by some persons of his own turn of mind, and bestowed the vacant curacy of the place upon a student of the same cast. Christian David, a carpenter, persuaded a number of Moravians to forsake their popish religion and country, and settle with

the Count Zinzendorf, who gladly received them, and assigned them a spot in a wood where they might build themselves houses. In hopes of a plentiful increase, David marked out the directions for the streets. Numbers from Moravia flocked to this new settlement, and built themselves houses. The Count built a residence for himself among his sanctimonious brethren. In 1732 the inhabitants were increased to six hundred. An orphan house, and other public buildings were fitted up. The place was called Herrnhut, which signifies the guard and protection of the Lord. Till 1729 the Count and his followers professed to be strict adherents to the Lutheran confession, and if any marked an inclination towards Calvinism, the Count was at pains to cure it. But finding that most of his new colony were Moravians, he thought it for his honour to pretend they were the offspring of the pure Bohemians, who had kept themselves separated from both the Lutheran and the Reformed. He styled them an incomparable people, the theocracy, the hundred and forty four thousand servants of the Lamb, who had his mark on their foreheads.

Zinzendorf informs us, that about 1749 he had almost a thousand labourers dispersed throughout the world, that they had awakened twenty-four different nations from their spiritual drowsiness, preached the Gospel in fourteen different languages, and had ninety-eight establishments, amongst which were castles with twenty, fifty, or even ninety apartments.

They spread themselves on every side; as far as Greenland, on the north, and the Cape of Good Hope, towards the south; and to China, in the east, and America, in the west. They principally suc-

ceeded in Wetteravia, Holland, and the British dominions. The discovery of Zinzendorf's ambitious and covetous designs, sank their credit in Wetteravia, and procured their expulsion from Denmark. Though he boasted of drawing 20,000 from the Reformed into the Lutheran church, yet when he perceived his followers' harmony in opinion to decrease as their numbers increased, he distinguished them into three troops or classes, the Calvinistical, to whom Watteville, his son-in-law, became bishop in 1743, the Moravian, and the Lutheran, which he thinks the best. While he pretended, that no Christian needed make any change in his religion in order to become a Herrnhutter, he insisted on the rights of this society to claim all the children of God wherever they can be found.

It would be useless to enter farther into the follies and absurdities of this sect. It is this sect, however, whom Wesley, the Methodist chief, once so highly extolled, and, it is said, invited to the British dominions, and from whom he copied a part of his rules. Only while Zinzendorf took the Antinomian side, Wesley gradually appeared a furious Arminian.

Brown's General History, &c.



REVELATION xiv. 11.

"And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever."

(UNITARIANISM.)

"It would be very unreasonable to infer the gloomy doctrine of eternal misery from the loose

and figurative language of a prophetic vision, in opposition to the plainest dictates of reason and justice, and to the whole tenor of divine revelation. But if any one is disposed to lay undue stress upon this text, it may be sufficient to remark, that it is not here asserted that the torment continues, but that the smoke of it ascends for ever and ever. The smoke of a pile in which a criminal has been consumed may continue to ascend long after the wretched victim has ceased to suffer. And a memorial of the punishment which has been inflicted on vice may remain long after vice itself has been utterly extirminated. After all, as the prophecy relates wholly to states of things in the present world, the punishments threatened ought, in all reason, to be understood of temporal punishments, and not of the sufferings of a future life. So in Jude, ver. 7, Sodom and Gomorrah are represented as suffering the vengeance of eternal fire, i. e. of a temporal calamity, a fire which completely destroyed them."

Note to the Unitarian Version.



REVELATION xvii. 6.

"Martyrs."

Dr. Mosheim observes, that the worship of the martyrs was modelled, by degrees, according to the religious services that were paid to the gods before the coming of Christ.

For a full account of this matter, see Beausobre, *Hist. du Manicheism*, tom. ii. p. 642.

REVELATION xx. 2, 3.

“ And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, and after that he must be loosed a little season.”

In the tenth century immense consternation was excited by these words. Many imagined that St. John had clearly foretold that after a thousand years from the birth of Christ, Satan was to be let loose from his prison, antichrist to come, and the destruction and conflagration of the world to follow these great and terrible events. In many places, temples, palaces, and noble edifices, both public and private, were suffered to decay, nay, were deliberately pulled down, from a notion that they were no longer of any use, since the final dissolution of all things was at hand.

When an eclipse of the sun or moon happened to be visible, the cities were deserted, and their miserable inhabitants fled for refuge to hollow caverns, and hid themselves among the craggy rocks, and under the bending summits of steep mountains. Almost all the donations that were made to the church during this century, carry evident marks of this groundless panic that had seized all the European nations, as the reasons of these donations are generally expressed in the following words. “ *Appropinquante mundi termino,*” &c. The end of the world being now at hand, &c.

Bernard of Thuringe is said to have added considerably to this consternation.

In the words of a French writer, “ *Pour concilier plus de créance à son sentiment, Bernard l'appuyait*

d'un raisonnement ridicule, mais qui fut convaincant pour beaucoup de monde ; il prétendit que, lorsque le jour de l'annonciation de la sainte Vierge se rencontrerait avec le vendredi saint ce serait une marque certaine que la fin du monde approchait."

See Hist. Litt. de France, tom v. p. 11. Abbo, Apologet. ad Callem Codicis Canonum Veteris Ecclesiae Romanae, a Francisco Pithae, p. 401.



REVELATION xx. 4.

"And they lived and reigned with Christ one thousand years."

No. 1.

(CERINTHUS.)

Cerinthus required his followers to retain part of the Mosaical law, but to regulate their lives by the example of Christ, and taught, that after the resurrection, Christ would reign upon earth, in a new Jerusalem, with his faithful disciples, a thousand years, which would be spent in the highest sensual indulgences. This mixture of Judaism and Oriental philosophy was calculated to make many converts ; and this sect soon became very numerous. They admitted a part of St. Matthew's Gospel, but rejected the rest, and held the Epistles of St. Paul in great abhorrence.

Cerinthus, who was by birth a Jew, may be placed with propriety among the Gnostics, though the learned are not entirely agreed whether he be-

longs to the heretics of the first or the second century.

See Basnage. Annal. Polit. Eccles. tom. ii. p. 6. Faydit Eclaircissements sur l'Histoire Ecclesiastique. Buddeus. Theodoret. Fabul. Hæret. lib. ii. cap. 3.

No. 2.

(MILLENARIANS—PIETISTS.)

The name of Millenarians has been given to those who believed that Jesus Christ would reign upon earth with his saints in a new Jerusalem, during one thousand years before the Day of Judgment.

Various have been the opinions and speculations on this subject. A popular belief among those who steered between Judaism and Christianity, appears to have been, that after the coming of Antichrist, there would be a first resurrection, (ver. 5.) when the just only would rise again; but that the lives of those who were then on earth, both good and bad, would be preserved; the good to be under obedience to the just raised from the dead, as to princes; and the wicked to be overcome by the just, and made subject unto them.

Jesus Christ will then descend from heaven, and Jerusalem, as well as the Temple, will be built anew.

Some have gone so far, as to mark with precision the places where both shall be rebuilt, and even to mention their extent. They applied to this Jerusalem what is said by St. John in Rev. xxi. 2, and to the Temple what is written by Ezekiel. They supposed it to be during this reign, that Jesus Christ will drink the new wine of which he spake at the Last Supper.

Although many absurdities have been interwoven with this subject, the opinions of the Millenarians have been partially adopted by many of the fathers, as Justin, Irenæus, &c.

See Tillemont, tom. ii. Art. Mil. p. 300.

These opinions have revived among the Pietists in Germany.

Stockman's Lexicon.

No. 3.

(FIFTH MONARCHY MEN.)

About the middle of the seventeenth century, a set of turbulent enthusiasts, denominated *fifth monarchy men*, were in expectation of King Jesus, and of a glorious thousand years' reign of Christ upon earth.

They were for pulling down churches, for discharging tithes, and leaving religion free, (as they called it) without either encouragement or restraint.

Most of them were for destroying the clergy, and for breaking every thing that looked like a national establishment.

See Burnet's Hist. of his own Times.

The Fifth Monarchy Men, having failed in their design in Parliament, agreed to the number of three hundred to attempt a revolution of government by force; and having killed the Protector, to proclaim King Jesus; but secretary Thurloe, who never spared cost to gain intelligence, had a spy among them, who discovered their intrigues, and seized their arms and ammunition in Shoreditch, with their

standard, containing a lion couchant, alluding to the lion of the tribe of Judah, with this motto, "who will rouse him up."

Neal.

REVELATION xx. 6.

"On such the second death hath no power."

No. 1.

(UNITARIANISM.)

"This seems to imply, that there will also be a resurrection for those over whom the second death hath power; that is, that the wicked themselves may be ultimately restored to virtue and happiness."

Note to the Unitarian Version.

No. 2.

(ORIGEN—UNIVERSALISTS.)

The doctrine of Origen, and some of the fathers, that the punishment of hell will not be everlasting, has since that time been supported under the name of the doctrine of universal restitution, and those who profess it are termed Universalists.

Gregory's History of the Church.

REVELATION xx. 10.

“ And shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever.”

(UNITARIANISM.)

“ This text has also been alleged, but with little reason, in favour of what has been called the heart-withering doctrine of eternal torments. See chap. xiv. 11, and the Note there.

“ The persons who are here said to be tormented for ever and ever, are not real, but figurative and symbolical persons—the devil, the beast, and the false prophet.”

Note to the Unitarian Version.

REVELATION xxi. 2.

“ New Jerusalem.”

(MILLENARIANS.)

(See Note on Rev. xx. 4. No. 2.)

REVELATION xxi. 6.

“ I am Alpha and Omega.”

(MARK.)

Mark, who lived in the second century, and was a disciple of Valentine, maintained, among other crude fancies, that the *plenitude* and *perfection* of truth resided in the Greek alphabet; and alleged

that as the reason why Jesus Christ was called the Alpha and Omega.

A French writer observes, “ chez les Grecs, c'étaient les lettres de l'alphabet qui exprimaient les nombres ; ainsi l'expression de tous les nombres possibles était renfermée dans les lettres de l'alphabet Grec. Marc en conclut que ce nombre était le plus parfait des nombres, et que c'était pour cela que Jesus Christ avait dit qu'il était Alpha et Omega ; ce qui supposait que ce nombre renfermait toutes les perfections et toutes les vertus possibles. Marc ne douta donc plus qu'il n'eut démontré que le nombre des Eons qui produisaient tout dans le monde, était de vingtquatre.

See Philastr. de Hær. c. 42. Theodoret. Hær. Fab. l. i. c. 9. Irenæus contr. Hær. l. i. c. 14. p. 70.

A

REFUTATION

OF

UNITARIANISM.

- No. I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.—*Extracts from D'Oyly and Vince.*
- II. ON THE FIRST TWO CHAPTERS OF ST. MATTHEW AND ST. LUKE.—*Rennell.*
- III. ON THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST.—*Nares.*
- IV. ON JOHN i. 1. AND ROM. ix. 5.—*Laurence and Nares.*
- V. ON THE WORD “*Λύτρον*”.—*Nares.*
- VI. ON THE HOLY GHOST AND TRINITY.—*Vince.*

No. I.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

"In the first place, those, whose enquiries on the subject of the Unitarian Controversy may have been confined within a narrow compass, should be made most fully aware, that the question on which we are at issue with the Unitarians, is by no means a new question in any of its parts or bearings. When, indeed, it is observed, with what confidence of expression, and in how imposing a tone, arguments are framed, and interpretations of Scriptural texts proposed, at the present day, against the doctrines of the Trinity and the Atonement, it might reasonably be supposed, that something was advanced which had never been advanced before; that some reasonings were submitted to the judgment of the Christian world, on which that judgment had never before been taken. The real state of the question, however, very ill accords with any such supposition. Exactly the same arguments, which the Unitarian writers of the present day are producing, have been produced by the advocates of the same cause years and years ago. These arguments, at the time when they severally made their appearance, were fairly met, and regularly examined; and received that full confutation which set them completely at rest. At several subsequent periods, the discussions have been renewed; the old objections, again produced, have again sunk under confutation; and the foundations on which the received doctrines rest, have remained unshaken and unimpaired. Now, it is by no means matter of slight importance, that persons who are inexperienced in these matters,

should completely understand, that such is the advanced state of the controversy between the Orthodox Christian Church and the Unitarian Dissenters. They will then learn to be properly on their guard against the confident tone and imposing terms with which the Unitarian arguments are proposed; and by understanding the probability of their having been already produced and confuted in many former discussions of the subject, will, antecedently to all particular examination of their weight and value, at least divest them of that delusive importance, in which a false opinion of their novelty might be too apt to clothe them ^a.

“A second observation, eminently useful for those who encounter Unitarian arguments, is, that the great doctrines, against which they are directed, are not isolated, unconnected doctrines, or resting merely on single texts; but that they are intimately connected each with the other, receive and give mutual support, are established by various proofs more and less direct, and are interwoven with the whole body of Scriptural language. The important truth, that our Saviour is very and eternal God, does not rest merely on the single texts, in which he is eminently and distinctly styled God^b: it is spoken in the history of his birth^c, in the descriptions of his attributes and character^d, of his eternal existence^e, of his

“^a Let the reader turn, for example, to Leslie’s Dialogues with a Socinian, published in confutation of some Unitarian productions of about the year 1690; he will there find a full, detailed, and specific answer to every main and important argument on which the Unitarians are resting with so much confidence at the present day; he will there find them met at every point, and pursued through all their windings; he will find the unsoundness of all their proposed interpretations fully exposed, and those which confirm the received doctrines, established by conclusive reasonings. He will there see, in fact, a complete confutation of every thing that can be called important in the late ‘Improved Version,’ composed more than a century before this version made its appearance. Some few discoveries, indeed, there are of modern Unitarians, to the credit of which their predecessors of less recent times are not entitled; and amongst these must eminently be reckoned the objections on which they now insist, with no small perseverance, to the authenticity of the narratives of the miraculous conception in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke; objections which, though resting on positions obviously weak and inconclusive, are framed and proposed in a spirit of hazardous adventure, to which it is only of late that the advocates of the Unitarian cause have had the hardihood to advance.”

“^b John i. 1.; Acts xx. 28.; 1 John iii. 16, and v. 20.; Rev. i. 8. xix. 16, &c.”

“^c Matt. i.; Luke i.”

“^d John iii. 13.; Matt. xviii. 20. xxviii. 17. 20.; Col. ii. 3.; John xx. 28, &c.”

“^e John i. 1.; Phil. ii. 6.; Col. i. 17, &c.”

agency in the creation^f, it pervades, in fact, the whole tenor of Scripture; it is conveyed in the tone and spirit on which all Scriptural statements and reasonings proceed. So the doctrine of the atonement is not only declared directly by those passages which speak of Christ as ‘the propitiation for our sins^g,’ as ‘delivered up for us all^h,’ as one ‘by whom we have received the atonementⁱ;’ but is deduced, by indirect inference, from various passages implying its truth, and proceeding on the supposition of it. And these two doctrines are so connected, that they must stand or fall together. If our Saviour was really God, he must have died to atone for human sins. If he died to atone for human sins, he must have been a being at least far superior to man. Let it then be always remembered, that not only is the force of particular texts to be examined singly, but the general tone of Scripture is to be sifted, and various texts are to be considered collectively as they afford mutual explanation. The opponent of our faith is always disposed to take single, isolated passages, and of these to fritter away the meaning, by viewing them unconnected with others. Now, little as we have reason to shrink from any mode of interpreting Scripture, provided the received meaning of the words be preserved, and an adherence to the rules of fair criticism be maintained: still we do not consent that, by such a method, the question is placed on its just ground, and that the surest mode of obtaining right conclusions is adopted. It is by catching the spirit of the sacred writings, by viewing the texts in their several bearings, by discovering their general scope, that scriptural truth is to be placed on its true basis, is to be developed in its full and unclouded brightness.”

D'Oyly's Discourse on Modern Unitarianism.

“In our contest with the Unitarian, we might venture to leave out (without giving up,) the disputed texts on which he principally dwells, and defend our opinions upon the declarations made in the other parts of the sacred writings, as scarcely admitting any *strainings* that can give the least

^f “Heb. i. 10; John i. 3. 10; Col. i. 16, &c.”

^h “Rom. viii. 32.”

^g “1 John ii. 2.”

ⁱ “Rom. v. 11.”

shadow of support to our adversaries; of this ground of defence we have, perhaps, not availed ourselves so much as we might^k. They attack, where they imagine there is at least some reason for dispute, to keep out of sight other matters which admit of no cavilling. It is a general rule, and can be no where applied with so much advantage as in the Scriptures, that we must explain the obscure parts by those which are more clear. That Christ came to make satisfaction for the sins of the world, is frequently stated, and under various forms; we are assured, that he was the propitiation for our sins; that he bare our sins in his own body on the tree; that we are bought with a price; that he came to give his life a ransom for many; that he redeemed us with his blood; that if Christ be not raised, ye are yet in your sins. Now, however the meaning of the terms used in some of these expressions, may have been controverted, yet the last text involves no terms which can admit of dispute; a similar text is also found in Rom. iv. 25. These texts contain a declaration in plain language, of the doctrine of atonement. Again, our Saviour says, 'This is my commandment, that ye love one another, as I have loved you. Greater love than this hath no man, that a man lay down his life for his friend.' This also is a declaration, unencumbered with any terms which can give occasion for controversy, that the death of Christ, hath, some how or other, operated to procure our salvation. In conformity with this, the Apostle says, 'for scarcely for a righteous man will one die, yet peradventure for a good man, one would even dare to die: but God commendeth his love to us, in that whilst we were sinners, Christ died for us.' On this Macknight (Rom. v. 7, 8,) says, 'the dying *ὑπερ* for a just man and *for* a good man is here evidently dying in their room or stead. And *therefore* Christ dying, *ὑπερ ἡμῶν*, for

^k " On this ground we may satisfactorily establish the doctrine of *faith and works*. Throughout the gospels, *good works* are represented as absolutely necessary to procure salvation; there is scarcely a page in which this is not taught and strongly enforced on our practice; it is one of the most prominent doctrines of our Saviour; it is what he more particularly insists upon, as without which 'no man can see the Lord.' That *faith* also is necessary, is agreed upon. Without, then, entering into any disputes about faith and good works, arising from certain texts in the epistles, we may pronounce them both to be necessary. Either we must admit this, or that the gospels are at variance with the other parts of Scripture."

us, hath the same meaning.' And he further observes, that 'Raphelius, in his note on this verse, from Xenophon, hath shewn, that the phrase died, *ὑπερ*, *for us*, signifies died in our stead.' Jesus Christ is expressly stated to be the *Saviour* of mankind; but by imposing further duties upon us, had he taught the necessity of repentance only, doing nothing to render it efficacious, he would *not* have been the *Saviour* of the world; on the contrary, he would have increased the difficulty of working out our salvation, and our 'last state would have been worse than the first.' To whom much is given, of him much will be required. *How*¹ the sufferings of Christ operated to procure man's redemption, we hazard no conjecture; we do undertake to shew the connection of cause and effect; but if Christ be not a divine person; if he did not die for our salvation; if he be not our advocate with the Father, we may venture to assert, that the greater part of the New Testament is not only unnecessary, but is all a delusion, and one of the greatest deceptions ever imposed on the world.

"In our interpretation of particular texts, or when we venture to maintain any opinions, we must remember that we are answerable for all the consequences which may thence be deduced. Let us, then, before we promulgate our doctrines, seriously consider, what inferences can be drawn from them, and whether they may not be turned against ourselves. But our adversaries seem to look no further than the point which upon the occasion they want to establish, unmindful how far their principles may agree with other parts of Scripture, or even with their own opinions elsewhere delivered. Dr. Priestley admits the redemption by Jesus Christ, but says, it was brought about by the Gospel, as promoting repentance and reformation^m. Granting the plan of redemption here

¹ "Though we cannot say *how* they operate, it implies no contradiction to suppose they may so operate; and this, without solving the difficulty, is sufficient to do away its effect as an objection. In human judicature, a man is punished for the sake of deterring others from offending; and this is allowed to be a wise and necessary provision. This is strictly a vicarious punishment, and indeed similar to that of Christ suffering for the sins of the world, for Christ died to take away sin; man dies to prevent its commission. In both cases, however, one person suffers for the benefit of another. And it may be observed, that it implies no contradiction, that in the union of the divine and human natures, the latter may suffer without the former."

^m "Dr. P. in his *Notes on the Scriptures*, says, 'Nor did his (Christ's) sacrifice consist

contended for, John the Baptist was also our redeemer; for he was sent by God to preach repentance and the remission of sins, and urged his hearers to bring forth fruits meet for repentance. The Apostles also may lay claim to the same title, as it was left for them to give such further instructions, as circumstances might require. Here Dr. P.'s scheme proves too much. Further, on this ground of redemption, how could the coming of Christ operate to the benefit of those who lived before he came, or who never heard his name? How could Christ be said to 'have died for all?' Here it proves too little. And, we may ask, where, in this case, is the *mystery* of our redemption? Such are the consequences of interpreting Scripture, without considering what may be the whole bearing of the exposition. The doctor says, (Notes on the Scriptures,) 'Jesus did not teach any thing properly *new*;' Jesus himself says the contrary; 'A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another;' he taught *universal* benevolence and charity; what new doctrine is this?

"Dr. Priestley also asserts, that 'the declarations of Divine mercy are made without reserve or limitation to the truly penitent, throughout *all* the books of Scripture, without the *most distant hint* of any regard being had to the *sufferings* or *merit* of *any being whatsoever*.' We hardly know in what decent terms to speak of this very extraordinary assertion; to say that there is not the *most distant hint* is certainly false; the plain language of Scripture is in direct opposition to it; he may dispute the interpretation, but that very dispute makes against him. We may, however, here set the doctor in opposition to himself; for he says, 'this prophecy *seems* to represent the death of Christ in the light of a *sacrifice for sin*.' Dr. P. further says, 'that Christ being a man who

of such animals as were slaughtered for this purpose in the earthly sanctuary, but of *himself*. And having *offered* his own *blood*, by which a *real* and *not* an *emblematical atonement* was made, he entered into the holy of holies, which is heaven.' 'As it is sufficient for men in general to die once, before the general Judgment, so Jesus died only once to *atone* for the sins of his followers, who expect his second coming, not for the purpose of offering himself any more, but in a state of glory, which he will share with his disciples.' How is this consistent with the above-mentioned scheme of redemption, or with Christ's having made *no* atonement? It looks as if the doctor, near the close of his life, had changed his opinion respecting the office of Christ."

suffered and died in the best of causes, there is nothing so very different in the *occasion* and *manner* of his death from that of others who suffered and died after him in the same cause of Christianity, but that *their* sufferings and death may be considered in the same light as *his*.' (Theol. Res. vol. i. p. 39.) We might have asked the doctor if there was nothing *attending* his death very different from whatever attended the death of any other person; for it is here not *fair* to leave out any circumstances, although it may be *convenient*. There was darkness over all the land for three hours; the earth quaked, the rocks were rent, the graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many. Did such extraordinary circumstances ever attend the death of any other person? Further, our Saviour's own words directly contradict Dr. P. 'ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to have entered into his glory?' 'Thus it is written, and thus it *behoeth* Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead on the third day.' These words imply, that there were great and indispensable reasons for his death and resurrection; something very different in the *occasion* from the death of every other person. Mr. Belsham admits, that Jesus Christ ascended into heaven, but says, as we are ignorant where he resides, and how he is engaged, there can be no proper foundation for *religious addresses* to him, nor of *gratitude for favours received*, nor of *confidence in his future interposition in our behalf*. Does then the knowledge of *where* a person resides entitle us to his favours? On this ground we may deny the providence of God. Mr. B. de-

"As in Mr. B.'s scheme of Christianity there appears to be no ground for our religious addresses to Christ, so, in conformity with this, he proposes an abolition of the Sabbath, representing it as *destructive of religion and morality*. He *affirms*, that the Christian religion has not appointed a day for the purpose of divine worship; nay, that it has *expressly abolished* such a distinction of days. If our Saviour abolished the observance of the fourth commandment, we may ask Mr. B. what part of the New Testament contains this *express* abolition. Christ says he came *not to destroy* the law and the prophets, but to *fulfil* them. In confirming the moral laws of Moses, the decalogue was necessarily included; and to confirm that which is already appointed, has all the effect of an original appointment. If the laws which Christ came to fulfil, did not include the decalogue, we are then equally set free from the restraints of all the commandments."

cribes the Gospel to be nothing more than the Deism of the French Theophilanthropists, except in the fact of the death and resurrection of Christ, which, he says, ‘has *proved* to us the certainty of a future life.’ No such thing; that a man *may* be raised from the dead, and that he *will* be raised, are two different things; Christ’s own resurrection, or that of those whom he raised from the dead, prove the former; but we must have his word, and we *have* his word, for proof of the latter. His death was therefore intended to answer some other purpose, important undoubtedly; and the Scriptures tell us what that purpose was—to make atonement for the sins of the world. Here is an object most worthy of such a sacrifice; and if we reject this, we can assign no adequate reason for his death. The other purposes for which he came into the world might have been accomplished without it; he might have taught us our duties, promised us the assistance of the Holy Spirit to enable us to work out our salvation, raised certain persons from the dead to shew the possibility of our resurrection, proclaimed a state of immortality, ascended into heaven, and there become a mediator between God and man. May we, then, not ask our adversaries, for what purpose it ‘*behoved* Christ to suffer?’

“To support the doctrines of the Unitarian, figurative expressions are resorted to, whenever the literal meaning stands in his way; but even this will not always be sufficient; for Dr. Priestley, in his History of the Corruptions of Christianity, makes this confession. ‘In this, then, let us acquiesce; not doubting but that, though not perhaps at present, we shall, in time, be able, without any *effort* or *straining*, to explain all particular expressions in the Apostolical Epistles;’ an indirect acknowledgement, that he has sometimes been obliged to *strain* the Scriptures for the support of his opinions. When he is hard pressed to defend an hypothesis, ‘he will *suppose* the verse in question (John vi. 62.) to be an interpolation, or the Apostle dictated one thing, and his amanuensis wrote another.’ Sometimes the Apostles are charged with misleading us. The two principal passages relating to the intercession of Christ, are Rom. viii. 34, and Heb. vii. 25. Here Mr. Belsham says, it is difficult to ascertain the exact import of the phrase, for ‘*probably* the writers themselves annexed to

it no very distinct ideas.' We had, however, rather trust the authority of Scripture, than Mr. B.'s 'probably.' When the meaning of a text, making against the Unitarian, is too plain to be controverted, the sacred writers are charged with 'producing lame accounts, improper quotations, and inconclusive reasonings.' (Dr. P.'s Twelfth Letter to Mr. Burn.) And in the Doctor's Notes on Scripture, he cautions us not to look upon the Apostles as inspired writers, but like other writers, liable to inaccuracies and imperfections. Admitting all this, what confidence can we have in the Sacred Writings, and what doctrines may not thus be supported °?"

Vince's "Caution against being misled by the Unitarian Interpretation of Scripture," added to his "Charge to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Bedford, 1810."

No. II.

ON THE FIRST TWO CHAPTERS OF ST. MATTHEW AND ST. LUKE.

"THE first object which presents itself to the reader of this 'IMPROVED VERSION,' is not a system of gradual reform, or partial amendment, but a sort of revolutionary *coup-de-main*

° " Without entering into any dispute respecting the nature of Christ, considering him as a person appointed by God to give man a more perfect knowledge of his duties, to promulgate a future state, and on what terms we may obtain eternal happiness; and that in the execution of this office, he chose certain persons to assist him, to be witnesses of what he said and did, to record those things, and to give, after his departure, such further instructions as might be judged necessary; granting, we say, this as the appointment of God, we are bound in reason to conclude, that God would not suffer them to record any thing relative to those matters, but what was true. The *rational* Christian must allow this. That in other respects they had the common failings of mankind, they themselves have assured us. But when employed by God to record what was necessary for us and for our salvation, it would be the height of impiety to suppose he would suffer them to make a false statement to the world. We may dispute the meaning of certain parts of Scripture, and what is genuine; but it can never be admitted, that the Apostles, appointed by God to reveal his will, actually recorded or taught any *doctrine* that was false; and yet this charge is brought against them by our opponents."

in the art of criticism; by rejecting the first two chapters of St. Matthew, excepting the genealogy, and by a similar reprobation of the first two chapters of St. Luke, excepting the four verses of the preface. They are not indeed actually omitted, but they are printed in Italics, as an intimation that they are of doubtful authority. Besides this, the substance of two long notes plainly informs the reader, that not only the chapters themselves ought to be condemned as spurious and interpolated, but also that the facts which they relate are fabulous and improbable. As the disputed chapters in both Gospels are affected by the same arguments, and rest upon nearly the same evidence, I shall first consider, one by one, the objections which the improving translators have advanced against the authenticity of the first two chapters of St. Luke, as they are drawn up at the greatest length, and in the clearest form.

“ The objections which they propose to our notice, are six in number.

“ I. *The Evangelist expressly affirms, that Jesus had completed his thirtieth year in the fifteenth year of Tib. Cæsar, iii. 1. 23. He must, therefore, have been born fifteen years before the death of Augustus, A.U.C. 752, or 753; but the latest period assigned for the death of Herod is the spring of A.U.C. 751, and he died probably the year before. See Lardner's Works, vol. i. p. 423—428, and Jones' Development of Facts, vol. i. p. 365—368. Herod, therefore, must have been dead upwards of two years before Christ was born. A fact which invalidates the whole narration. See Grotius on Luke iii. 23.*

“ The answer to this objection is so universally known and approved, that it appears almost superfluous to state, that the commencement of the reign of Tiberius is dated from his partnership in the empire; an event which took place three years before the death of Augustus, and is recorded both in Paterculus and Dio. Josephus has twice used this mode of computation; first, where he states the reign of Herod to have lasted thirty-seven years, he includes the three last years of his predecessor Antigonus, at the beginning of which time he was declared king by the Roman Senate: and, secondly, where Augustus is said to have reigned fifty-seven years and a half,

we are informed, that the first fourteen years were in partnership with Antony. By this mode of computation, every chronological difficulty respecting the birth of our Lord, instantly vanishes. Had the improving translators attempted to have invalidated the calculations of Prideaux, Pearce, &c. they might have claimed our attention; but surely a repetition of the worn-out objection, instead of a refutation of the answer, is a strong presumption, that the former is as unfounded as the latter is incontrovertible.

“ II. *The first two chapters of this Gospel were wanting in the copies used by Marcion, a reputed heretic of the second century; who, though he is represented by his adversaries as holding some extravagant opinions, was a man of learning and integrity, for any thing that appears to the contrary. He, like some moderns, rejected all the evangelical histories, excepting Luke, of which he contended that his own was a correct and authentic copy.*

“ The candour and liberality of the improving translators cannot be too much admired in thus exalting the character of their champion Marcion; but as many important circumstances in his history have escaped their notice, it may not be improper for me to observe,

“ First, As to the motives of the heresy of Marcion; that he was expelled from the church for the crime of seduction, and upon his petition for re-admission being rejected, he enlisted himself under the banners of Cerdo. *Epiphan. Adv. Hær. i. Hær. xlii. p. 803. Edit. Colon.*

“ Secondly, As to his integrity. It is true that he rejected the first two chapters in St. Luke: but not content with this, he mutilated the rest, making not only such omissions, but even such additions as might suit his absurd tenets, which Epiphanius has recorded in the following marked and forcible passage, to which the improving translators would do well to give their earnest attention: οὐ μόνον δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπέτεμεν, ὁ λυμαινόμενος ἑαυτὸν, ἥπερ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ τέλους καὶ τῶν μέσων πολλὰ περιέκοψε τῶν τῆς ἀληθείας λόγων, ἅλλα δὲ παρά τὰ γεγραμμένα προστέθεικε, p. 309. He pursued the same system also with the Epistles of St. Paul. Thus much then for the integrity of Marcion, so much admired by the improving translators.

“ Thirdly, As to his opinions, which the improving translators seem to insinuate, were considered only by his adversaries as extravagant. They who believe neither in angel nor devil, will find some difficulty in accommodating their notions to his doctrine of three separate and distinct divinities, viz. the Father, as Author of the Law; the Son, as Author of the Gospel; and the Holy Spirit as distinct from either. Besides, Marcion had a purpose to answer by the omission of these chapters, which was very different from that of the improving translators. He omitted these chapters, among others, to prove that Jesus Christ was not born in the natural way, but that he was actually the Son of the Supreme Being, and that he descended from heaven with a shadowy semblance only of body, for the sake of becoming visible to men. Now the improving translators would omit these same chapters upon the authority of Marcion, not to answer the purpose proposed by him, but to strengthen their argument respecting the real humanity of Christ, and to prove him the natural Son of Joseph. *Mosheim, Eccl. Hist. ii.*

“ III. *The Evangelist, in his Preface to the History of the Acts of the Apostles, reminds his friend Theophilus, Acts i. 1. that his former history contained not only an account of the public ministry of Jesus, but makes no allusion to the remarkable incidents contained in the first two chapters; which, therefore, probably were not written by him.*

“ Saint Luke reminds his friend Theophilus, that his former history contained not only an account of the public ministry of Jesus, but an account from the very beginning of his life and doctrine, ὃν ἤρξατο ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν, which the improving translators are pleased to render (with reference, no doubt, to this discussion), ‘undertook both to do and to teach,’ although they can give the same word in other places, Matt. iv. 17, &c. its proper sense of ‘began.’ And as a proof that this was the meaning of the Evangelist, he states, in the third verse of the first chapter of his Gospel, that ‘it seemed good to him, having accurately traced or followed up all things (which is the true sense of παρηκολουθηκότι πᾶσι) from the first, to write, &c.’ and before, in the second verse, he uses the expression ἀρχῆς from the beginning; to which he evidently alludes, Acts i. 1, by the word ἤρξατο, ‘began;’ not being willing to omit the

earliest circumstances, namely those of Christ's birth. St. Luke, therefore, does refer to his account of the remarkable incidents contained in these chapters. Farther, had no allusion on his part existed, the reality of these extraordinary events would no more have been affected by such an omission than that of the other miracles recorded in the Gospel, to which it was wholly unnecessary to refer in a history of subsequent transactions.

"But the improving translators have overlooked an allusion which St. Luke makes in a subsequent part of his Gospel, iii. 2, to some of the events which he had recorded in his first two chapters, by designating John as the Son of Zacharias, which none of the other Evangelists have done, as none besides himself had related the previous circumstances attending his birth.

"IV. *If the account of the miraculous conception of Jesus be true, he could not be the offspring of David and Abraham, from whom it was predicted that the Messiah should descend.*

"If the account be true, Jesus would equally be the offspring of David and Abraham according to the flesh. Although he was conceived by the Holy Ghost, he was born of Mary, a Jewess of the tribe of Judah, espoused to Joseph, who, like herself, was of the lineage and house of David, in order that his genealogy might be traced from thence.

"As a proof that the miraculous conception was not intended to invalidate this promise, in these very chapters the angel says, *The Lord God shall give him the throne of David his father*; i. 32. : and again, *He hath raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of David his servant*; i. 69. So far, then, the prediction, according to the expectation of the Jews, was fully accomplished. Perhaps the question proposed by Jesus Christ to the Pharisees, Matt. xxiii. 42, *What think ye of Christ? whose son is he?* may prove equally perplexing to the improving translators, and probably for nearly the same

REMARK

"But if the account of the miraculous conception be not true, how could this prediction have been fulfilled, *Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, &c.* Isaiah vii. which was the promised sign from the Lord. This prophecy must appear of the plainest and most pointed nature, and yet the improv-

ing translators, in their note on Matthew i. 1. assert, that *the reasoning from the prophecies in the Old Testament is inconclusive*; that is, that the prediction in question is misapplied. Now, by the miraculous conception, this plain prediction has been as plainly fulfilled, and the sign promised from the Lord has been fully and clearly given.

“ The extraordinary prophecy of Micah, *But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me, that is to be ruler in Israel*, must also fall to the ground if the truth of this history is invalidated.

“ V. *There is no allusion to any of these extraordinary facts in either of the succeeding histories of St. Luke, or in any other books of the New Testament. Jesus is uniformly spoken of as the son of Joseph and Mary, and as a native of Nazareth, and no expectation whatever appears to have been excited in the public mind by these wonderful and notorious events.*

“ The first part of this objection is a repetition of Objection III. to which I have given what will appear, I trust, a satisfactory answer. One thing, however, is to be observed, that contrary to the assertion of the improving translators, Jesus Christ is never called the son of Joseph except by the Jews, in surprise or contempt; Matt. xiii. 35.; Mark vi. 3.; Luke iv. 42.; John i. 45. vi. 12. The Evangelist informs us, Luke iii. 23. that he was supposed to be the son of Joseph, or, as the improving translators construe, ἐνομίζετο, was allowed by law, which is plainly telling us that he was not so in fact. Nor is he ever spoken of as a native of Nazareth, i. e. as being born there.

“ Respecting the place of our Lord’s nativity, the improving translators have given their opinion more at large in their note on Matthew i.

“ *If this account be true, the proper name of Jesus, according to the uniform custom of the Jews, would have been Jesus of Bethlehem, not Jesus of Nazareth.*

“ As Nazareth was the country and dwelling-place of his father, and as he was educated there, he would, according to the custom of every country, derive his name from thence, although from accidental circumstances he came into the world

in Bethlehem; and in the public register he would therefore be enrolled as a Nazarene. It might as well be denied that Virgil was born at Andes, because we are told in Ovid, 'Mantua Virgilio gaudet,' and because he is universally known by the appellation of the poet of Mantua. No one will deny that Apollonius the poet, because he is commonly known by the name of Rhodius, was born at Alexandria, having acquired the name by settling at Rhodes. Διόνυσος δὲ ὁ θρᾶξ, καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος, ὁ τοὺς Ἀργοναύτας ποιήσας, Ἀλεξανδρεῖς μὲν ἐκαλοῦντο δὲ Ῥόδιοι. *Strabo*, xiv. p. 969. Edit. Amst.

"As a farther proof that Bethlehem was considered the birth-place of Christ, a grove was planted there to the honour of Adonis, in the time of Adrian, near the place of Jesus Christ's nativity; and at the same time a statue of Jupiter was erected on Mount Calvary, to efface, if possible, the memory of the events which there took place. 'Bethlehem nunc nostram, et augustissimum in orbe locum, lucus incumbrabat Thammuz, et in specu, ubi Christus parvulus vagiit, veneris amasius plangebatur.' *S. Hieron. Epist. ad Paulin. de inst. Mon.* vol. i. p. 102, edit. Basil. Both of these remained till the time of Constantine.

"As to the want of great public expectation, the improving translators, having upon this point first taken for granted the matter in question, that these chapters are spurious, then proceed to deny the existence of the great public expectation recorded in them: and afterwards, reasoning in a circle, they introduce the want of public expectation as an argument against the authenticity of the chapters. But independant of the logical acuteness of this reasoning, have the improving translators forgot that Chalcidius the Platonist, in his Commentary on the *Timæus*, alludes to the appearance of the star, and the story of the wise men? Did not the classical learning of the improving translators suggest to them the very trite but most important testimony of Suetonius; 'Percrebuerat oriente toto vetus et constans opinio, esse in fatis, ut Judæa profecti rerum potirentur.' *Vit. Vesp.* iv. 8. See also *Tacitus, Hist.* v. 13. Besides these proofs of the great public expectation, the murder of the innocents was so notorious, as to give rise to the following observation of Augustus, recorded by Macrobius, ii. 4. 'Cum audisset (Augustus) inter

pueros quos in Syria Herodes rex Judæorum intra bimatum jussit interfici, filium quoque ejus occisum, ait, Melius est Herodis porcum esse quàm filium.'

" I cannot for a moment suppose that the omission of these remarkable passages, which tend so strongly to establish the authenticity of these chapters, can be attributed to ignorance, as the most superficial acquaintance with elementary theology must have presented them to every one's remembrance.

" VI. *The style of the first two chapters is different from the rest of the history. The date of the enrolment, ch. ii. 1, 2, is a great historical difficulty. That John the Baptist should have been ignorant of the person of Christ is not probable, if this narrative be true, John i. 31, 34. And there are many other circumstances in the story which wear an improbable and fabulous aspect. Evanson's Disson. chap. i. sect. iii. p. 67.*

" The improving translators have not condescended to point out how the first two chapters differ from the remainder either in style or language ; it would be indeed a difficult task even for their ingenuity to mark the distinction. The resemblance in every point might be much more easily demonstrated ; the copious description, the ' lactea ubertas' of St. Luke, appear throughout. Some proof at least of the authenticity of these chapters may be deduced from the occurrence of various words which appear almost peculiar to the writings of St. Luke, and are scarcely ever used by the other inspired authors. Thus ἡγεμονεύω is only to be found, ii. 2. and again, iii. 1. ; μεγαλειᾶ occurs only, i. 49. and again, Acts ii. 2. ; ἐλάβη is to be met with in no other place than ii. 5. and again, Acts ii. 15. viii. 22. ; ἀγαλλίασις and τελείωσι appear each once in the Epistle to the Hebrews, but no where else beyond the writings of St. Luke. An attentive examiner might discover many other words and phrases which are to be found only in the histories composed by this Evangelist. This circumstance alone, in a critical point of view, will furnish a strong testimony in favour of the authenticity of these chapters. What dissimilarity can the improving translators point out, which can outweigh, or even balance, this remarkable resemblance ?

" The historical difficulty, respecting the date of the enrolment, is simply this, that the enrolment actually took place

in Judea three years after the edict was issued at Rome. The historical difficulty would surely have been much greater, had a shorter time elapsed between the edict at Rome, and the execution of a measure so tedious in its operation in a province, or rather a district, removed at such a distance from the capital, and at that time governed by its monarch, by its own laws, and under the influence of its own peculiar prejudices.

“The truth of this narrative cannot be affected by the ignorance of John, with regard to the person of Christ; he could not reasonably be supposed to have been acquainted with him, although he was connected with him by birth, as the former was brought up in solitude and in the wilderness, the latter was educated with his parents at Nazareth.

“As for the last assertion, it will apply with equal force to every miracle recorded in the Old or New Testament, the existence of which the improving translators cannot with any consistency dispute.

“The following argument is adduced by the improving translators to invalidate the authority of the first two chapters of St. Matthew in particular.

“*From the testimony of Epiphanius and Jerome, we are assured that they were wanting in the copies used by the Nazarenes and the Ebionites, that is, by the ancient Hebrew Christians.*

“That is, by a body of men who lived three hundred years at least, according to Epiphanius, after the ancient Hebrew Christians. The very name of Nazarene, as a sect of Christians, was not known till after the final destruction of Jerusalem; and these were still a distinct body from the heretical Nazarenes mentioned by Epiphanius, A.D. 370. Nor can the heretical Ebionites, of whom Epiphanius treats, be more justly included under the term of *ancient Hebrew Christians*, at least if chronology has any connection with ecclesiastical history.

“After having thus briefly shown the anachronisms of the improving translators, it would be superfluous to state any thing farther on the subject, as some very judicious arguments on this point have been selected by the author of an article in the Quarterly Review, No. II. p. 322, and as the

controversy at large may be viewed in the letters of Horsley and Priestley on this point; and should the reader wish to draw his knowledge from the fountain-head of all the learning displayed on this subject, let him consult Bishop Bull.

“ By way of conclusion to the above observations, the refined liberality of the improving translators is pleased to assign the following motives for the interpolation in question.

“ It would, to the generality of Christians, be extremely gratifying, as it would serve to lessen the odium attached to Christianity, from its founder being a crucified Jew, and would elevate him to the dignity of the heroes and demigods of the heathen mythology.

“ What odium is this, which is to be attached to the cause of Christianity? what degradation is this, which is to disgust its followers, the corner-stone of whose faith rests upon the promises of a Saviour, according to the flesh, of the lineage and house of David; whose sure and certain hope is founded on the expiatory passion and death of a *despised and rejected Redeemer?*

“ We glory in the suffering and shame, and I speak the language of the whole Christian Church, we glory in the cross of Christ. The improving translators must know very little of the dignity of demigods and heroes, and still less of the opinions of the generality of Christians, to suppose that they could feel any gratification in elevating, through the medium of a false narrative, to the dignity of a hero or demigod, that Saviour, whom, according to the whole tenor of the Scriptures, they adore as God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God. The IMPROVING TRANSLATORS might have spared both their pains and their consciences in altering and mistranslating the Scriptures, had they merely wished to degrade our Lord from the rank of a hero or a demigod, and had they been really convinced that the generality of Christians esteemed him only as such.”

Rennell's “ Animadversions on the Unitarian Translation, or Improved Version of the New Testament.”

No. III.

ON THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST.

IN his Remarks on the Improved Version of the New Testament, Dr. Nares observes, " In regard to those two great doctrines of our Saviour's pre-existence and divinity, we find nothing but evasion; evasion the most *systematic*, and a choice of terms the most invariably *technical*, as appropriate exclusively to their own system of belief. Thus it is that Κύριε as addressed to our Lord, is too commonly rendered Sir, or Master, or Teacher, and the term προσκυνεῖν under the same circumstances, never allowed to stand for more than the mere act of obeisance. The Logos, or Word of God, is (we had almost said) accounted no more than a mere nickname of the *Prophet* Jesus; and the 'creation of *all things*,' is represented to be the creation of *nothing*. Not that we are at all disposed to deny that Κύριε may, with much propriety, in some places of Scripture, be rendered Sir, or Master; that προσκυνεῖν has the meaning of obeisance; that Jesus may be termed 'the Logos, because God revealed himself or his Word by him,' (as we are reminded that Archbishop Newcome explains it), or that there is no *new Creation* ever spoken of that is spiritual and strictly evangelical. But invariably to regard the expressions alluded to, as comprehending under them nothing more, no higher doctrines than are conveyed by the renderings and commentaries of the editors, is to suppress many real matters of fact, which tend to fix the true and undoubted meaning of the sacred writers. So far from enabling the judicious and attentive reader (as the editors profess) to understand Scripture phraseology, it is really to take from them the very best means of doing so.

" Nothing can be more true, than the remark of that eloquent writer Bishop Jeremy Taylor, ' that though every man may soon span his own knowledge, our ignorance we can never fathom.' In publications of the nature of the one before us,

the world in general would be utterly astonished to know, what a mass of ancient learning, including much matter of positive fact, is wholly kept out of sight, though of the utmost importance to the full understanding of the doctrines of Scripture.

“How should it be possible for any unlearned Christian to understand, where such information is studiously suppressed, that the very name of *God* is often given to Christ where the received translation only renders it *Lord*, and this *Improved Version*, *Sir* or *Master*? and yet this seems to me as capable of demonstration as any proposition in Euclid^p.

“For instance, that the name of *Jehovah* was, by the Jews, invariably understood to be so exclusively appropriated to God, as to be perfectly incommunicable to any creature, is a truth entirely indisputable; and any application of this title to a creature would always have been esteemed the most rank idolatry, the basest dereliction of the first great principle of their faith. Nevertheless, all the Evangelists begin their Gospels with the account of the preaching of Saint John the Baptist, declaring, that ‘this was he that was spoken of by the prophet Isaias, saying, the voice of one crying in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the LORD, make his path straight.’ Now, in the original prophecy of Isaias, xl. 3, the words are these, ‘prepare ye the way of JEHOVAH;’ and every body knows that the LXXII Jews, who made the Greek translation of the Bible, had no other term to express JEHOVAH but the term *Kύριος* a translation in fact of the substituted *Adonai* of the Jews, it should certainly be so rendered in the above passages of the Gospels; for ‘here,’ as every learned author says, ‘we find all the four Evangelists three of whom at least were Jews, bearing witness to the

^p “Mr. Lindsey has a curious way of getting over this difficulty. ‘The Apostles,’ he tells us, ‘were not so exact in the use of the words *Lord* and *Saviour*, which they gave *indifferently* both to *God* and *Christ*, never supposing that any would mistake their Lord and Master, so lately born and living among men, to be the Supreme God and object of worship.’ *Apology*, p. 147. But how shall we account for it being spoken of as the *peculiar* glory both of God and Christ, to be the universal Saviour of mankind; the *only* Saviour of the world? How shall we account for St. Paul’s expressly applying to Christ, Phil. ii. 10, what Isaias applies in the most peculiar manner to God, xlv. 23, as the just God and Saviour of man, than whom there is none none beside him of whom he was speaking?”—See *President Edwards’s Works*.

same thing, that Jesus is the JEHOVAH prophesied of by Isaiah, whose way the Baptist was to prepare^a.

"If any should be disposed to doubt whether *Kύριος* is equivalent to JEHOVAH, the editors of this work supply us with three instances of it in their rendering of Matt. xxii. 44; Mark xii. 36; Luke xx. 42. Here they themselves, with great propriety, render *ὁ Κύριος* Jehovah. And a Jewish Targum helps us to another remarkable fact upon this very passage. 'The Lord said unto my Lord,' is, in the T. of Jonathan, 'Jehovah said unto his Word.' This opens to us a new subject: for here is the WORD of JEHOVAH, the *Λόγος*, or WORD of GOD, fully acknowledged by a Jew, in a passage particularly appropriated to *himself* by our *blessed Saviour*, and evidently implying a personal distinction.

"These are all *positive facts*, which apply to every part of the Christian Scriptures, and the bare mention of which is sufficient to shew us, that a new version, in which such matters are *totally suppressed* or *disregarded*, cannot be a fair interpretation of the real sentiments of *Jewish* writers. None can be ignorant how much is said about the WORD of GOD in the first chapter of St. John's Gospel.

"All that the world in general will learn from this version, of this remarkable term, is, that it either means the *wisdom* of God, (according to our contemporary Mr. Lindsey,) or that it is a name given to our Saviour, because by *Him*, as *one* of his *Messengers* or *Prophets*, God revealed himself or his *Word* in the Gospel—given to him 'in the beginning,' *that is*, from the commencement of the Gospel dispensation, and *not before*. This is what the editors tell us; but undoubtedly the main question is, what must St. John have thought or known of the term? The editors certainly cite a passage from one of his Epistles, in order to make the Evangelist explain *himself*; but, as it often happens, what appears to *them* to confirm their apprehension of matters, appears to *us* most strongly to confirm *our* sense of things. This must

^a "In the Syriac the reading is, 'Prepare ye the way for our God.' See Ludov. de Dieu, and Griesbach's various readings. See on *ὁ Κύριος*, as expressive of Jehovah, Pearson, 150, and Sharp's Law of Nature, p. 276."

^b "Consult Bishop Patrick on Leviticus xxvi. 46, and Dr. Gill's Note on Gen. xvi. 13."

unavoidably happen; any expression, by a positive denial of the fact to which it is thought to allude, must, of course, appear to infer something else. So it is, that what is predicated of our Saviour, Gal. iv. 4, that he 'was made of a woman,' is perfectly understood by those who believe in his incarnation, to have an allusion to that peculiar doctrine; but take away the doctrine, and it must needs seem to allude to some different event. But the question must still remain, Was there any actual incarnation of a superior being to which it *might* bear allusion? and so stand the questions that relate to the sense of Κύριος and Λόγος in the Evangelical and Apostolic writings. They *may seem* to many to allude to nothing higher than what the version and commentaries of these editors imply; but it must remain a question, whether there *is* any thing more—any higher doctrines to which they *may* allude.

“ If Κύριος be the only Greek term used by Jewish writers for Jehovah, a question must naturally arise, whether it appears to have been ever so used by the Jewish writers of the New Testament, as necessarily to have conveyed to *their* minds the sense of Jehovah. If the Λόγος, or Word of God, was a title at all known to the Jews before the commencement of the Gospel dispensation, and before Christ was born into the world, a question must naturally arise, whether a Jewish writer, calling him the Λόγος, or WORD, could only intend it as an apt description of that prophet who was ordained to reveal to man the Gospel covenant. Ancient learning may come to be despised by all those who think modern philosophy far superior to it, but we cannot get rid of *facts*. We cannot, with all our philosophy, do more than object to the terms; we cannot possibly insist upon it, that a Jewish writer had not Jewish notions of the terms he used: nor can we, with any decency, pretend, that God would countenance the delivery of heavenly truths, in terms that must have conveyed one meaning at one time, and another at another. If it can be proved by fair argument, that the sense put upon certain expressions by the Unitarians could not possibly be the sense intended by Jewish writers of the first centuries, we cannot believe that sense to be the true one. The most ordinary understanding, I would hope, might be brought to apprehend what I mean; though while I wish to be quite as

generally intelligible as the editors of this new version, I must have leave to premise, that it is somewhat a harder task to bring forward ancient facts and ancient records, in support of the venerable writings in question, than to modernize them for common reading by a suppression of all the testimony to be drawn from the records of antiquity."

Nares' "Remarks on the Version of the New Testament, edited by the Unitarians."

No. IV.

ON JOHN i. 1. AND ROMANS ix. 5.

IN his *Critical Reflections on the "Unitarian Version,"* Dr. Laurence observes, "Among the various modes which have been adopted for the improvement of the received text, attempts, it is observed, have been made to correct it by *critical conjecture*. Upon this subject the following remarks occur: 'This is a remedy which ought never to be applied but with the utmost caution, especially as we are furnished with so many helps for correcting the text from manuscripts, versions, and ecclesiastical writers. This caution is doubly necessary, when the proposed emendation affects a text which is of *great importance in theological controversy, as the judgment of the critic will naturally be biassed in favour of his own opinions*. It ought perhaps to be laid down as a *general rule*, that the received text is *in no case* to be altered by critical, or at least by theological conjecture, how ingenious and plausible soever.'

"So far the reasoning is correct, and perfectly conformable with the established maxims of the most eminent critics: but what follows? 'nevertheless (it is added,) there is no reason why critical conjecture should be *entirely* excluded from the New Testament, any more than from the works of any other

ancient author; and some very plausible conjectures of no inconsiderable importance have been suggested by men of great learning and sagacity, which, to say the least, merit very attentive consideration. See particularly John i. 1. vi. 4, and Rom. ix. 5'; and a reference is made to Marsh's *Michaelis*, vol. ii. c. 10. Here is a manifest qualification of the preceding remark. Whatsoever ambiguity then may be supposed to exist in the idea of a *general* rule, which is *universal* in its application, it is certain that the authors of the new version only mean, by so expressing themselves, a rule which is in *most* cases to be observed, but which may in *some* be violated; and, by way of distinctly pointing out the nature of their exception, they refer to John i. 1. vi. 4. and Rom. ix. 5. The second reference indeed is not very important; but the first and third relate to theological conjectures, inimical to the doctrine of Christ's divinity. The first consists in the substitution of Θεοῦ for Θεός, in the clause καὶ Θεός ἦν ὁ Λόγος, and the second in reading ὡν ὁ for ὁ ὡν, in the passage ὁ ὡν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός, so as by this transposition to render its sense, 'of whom was God, who is over all;' necessarily precluding the interpretation usually affixed to these words. What then is their distinction? The *general* rule, which *in no case* admits theological conjecture, how ingenious and plausible soever it be, ought not, it seems, to stand in the way of any unauthorized emendations of the sacred text favourable to the Unitarian hypothesis: but do they mean to extend the same indulgent hypothesis to Trinitarian criticisms? Or do they conceive that it is only the judgment of the Trinitarian critic which is likely to be biassed by individual opinion?

"But in corroboration of what they advance, they refer the reader to Marsh's *Michaelis*, vol. ii. c. 10. In this chapter, which is entitled, 'Conjectural Emendations of the Greek Testament,' and upon which their whole reasoning, one might suppose, was founded, it is singular that *Michaelis* reprobates in the strongest terms all theological conjecture whatsoever, and that for this obvious reason, because 'a theologian, whose business it is to form his whole system of faith and manners from the Bible, cannot with propriety as-

sume previously any system of theology, by which he may regulate the sacred text, but must adopt that text which is confirmed by original documents, and thence deduce his theological system¹. Nor is this all. In direct opposition to the sentiments of those who quote him, and in the beginning of that very chapter to which they refer, he thus unequivocally expresses himself: 'It must be evident to every man, that the New Testament would be a very uncertain rule of life and manners, and indeed WHOLLY UNFIT TO BE USED AS A STANDARD OF RELIGION, if it were allowable, *as is the practice of several Socinians*, to apply critical conjecture in order to establish the tenets of our own party: For instance; if, in order to free ourselves from a superstitious doctrine, on the supposition that the divinity of Christ is ungrounded, we were at liberty to change, without any authority, Θεός ην ὁ Λόγος, John i. 1, into Θεοῦ ην ὁ Λόγος, and ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός, Rom. ix. 5, into ὢν ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός, the Bible would become so very uncertain, that every man might believe or disbelieve, as best suited his own principles².'

"Could these writers have possibly read the preceding passage when they made their appeal to the authority of Michaelis? If they had, they must surely have perceived that Michaelis is directly against them; and that the very conjectural emendations, originally proposed by *the Socinian theorists, Crell and Schlichting*, which they particularly notice as suggested by *men of great learning and sagacity*, and as *meriting, to say the least, very attentive consideration*, he directly censures, in the most pointed terms, and expressly brings forward to illustrate the position, that theological conjecture is *never* admissible. If, conscious of opposing an established maxim, which ought in no instance to be violated, they wished to shelter themselves from the storm of critical reproof, the gabardine of Michaelis was, most unfortunately, selected indeed as a place of refuge.

"To the passage which I have just quoted, from the first section of the chapter referred to, I will add one or two more from the last section of the *same* chapter, in order to place the opinion of Michaelis in a still clearer point of view. 'Thé

¹ "Michaelis, vol. ii. p. 413."

² "Michaelis, vol. ii. p. 387."

only plausible argument which an advocate for theological conjecture might use, not so much indeed *to convince himself of the justice of his cause, as to perplex his opponents*, is the following; namely, that the New Testament has been so corrupted by the ruling party, which calls itself orthodox, that the genuine doctrine of Christ and his Apostles is no longer to be found in it. But there is not the least room for a suspicion of this kind, as we have so great a number of manuscripts, versions, and ecclesiastical writings, in which the New Testament is quoted, of every age and every country^x. And in proof of his assertion, among other things, he remarks, that ‘the passages *which afforded the most perplexity to the members of the ruling Church are still extant in manuscripts, versions, and editions of the New Testament*; whereas the *spurious* passage, 1 John v. 7, though the orthodox seem to think it of the utmost importance, has never had the good fortune to find admittance into any Greek manuscript, or ancient version.’ If the compilers of this introduction, who, not only in the instance before me, but in almost every page, refer to the writings of Michaelis, will not admit the validity of the argument in the preceding extracts, they may, perhaps, feel the force of the following powerful appeal to Unitarian consistency: ‘As critical conjectures,’ observes the same author, ‘have been principally made by those who, in the language of the church, are termed heretics, I will invent one or two examples of the same kind in the name of the orthodox, and ask those of the opposite party, whether they would admit them as lawful conjectures. For instance, suppose I should alter *ὅτι ὁ πατήρ μου μείζων μου ἐστὶ*, John xiv. 18, to *ὅτι ὁ πατήρ μου ἐστὶ*, or *ὅτι ὁ πατήρ μου ζων μὲν ἐστίν*, in order to be freed from a text that implies an inequality between the Father and the Son; or, if I should read 1 John v. 20, in the following manner, *οὗτος ὁ υἱὸς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεός*, in order to shew more distinctly the divinity of Christ, I think the heterodox would exclaim, *he is either extremely ignorant, or, by having recourse to such miserable artifices, acknowledges the badness of his cause*. But the heterodox, as well as the orthodox, must appear before the

^x “Michaelis, vol. ii. p. 418.”

impartial tribunal of criticism, where there is no respect to persons, and where it is not allowed for one party to take greater liberties than the other'. As it is impossible to expose their reasoning more strongly than the critic himself has done, to whom they appeal for support; and that even in the very chapter which they quote, I shall add nothing more upon the subject, but leave them to enjoy, as they can, the testimony of Michaelis."

Laurence's "Critical Reflections upon some important Misrepresentations contained in the Unitarian Version of the New Testament."

"God forbid that I should be wilfully ludicrous upon such a subject; but so very strange do the comments of modern Unitarians appear to me, when pretending to expound matters according to the *Jewish phraseology*, they would insist upon it, that the *Unitarian sense* of the *Proem* of St. John's Gospel must have been so obvious *from the first*, as that *none* could mistake it, that I could scarcely express what I feel upon the subject, otherwise than by contrasting the above simple paraphrase, in which I have substituted the *Angelus Redemptor* for the *Logos*, with the perplexed account of matters as explained by the Unitarians.

"We may then fairly suppose *their* paraphrase to, run thus: *Εν αρχη ην ο Λογος*, 'in the beginning was the word.' By the beginning, I, by no means, intend the beginning of the creation, or of all things; but merely the beginning of the Gospel dispensation. I do not *specify* this to be my meaning, because I conclude you will perceive it, though I know well enough, that I express myself exactly as though I did mean it, and that *another* beginning *must* be present to *your* minds, when *the world was made*, by the *Logos* or *Word* of God: however, I certainly do *not* mean this; I mean to make no sort of allusion to any thing you may happen to know, or have previously heard, of the *Logos* or *Word* of God, by whom the world was made: but I mean merely to give this appellation to *Jesus Christ*, a man like myself, because he was commissioned to reveal the *Word* of God, (that is, in Greek, the *Λόγος*,) to mankind: it is what grammarians and rhetori-

cians would call a *metonymy*; I do not tell you this in my Gospel, because, notwithstanding any prejudices to the contrary, I think you must know it by *instinct*. καὶ ὁ Λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, 'and the word was with God;' that is, *not* with him really or personally, but how do you think? why, in the way of *retirement* or *private communion*, as might be the case with you, or me, or any other man. Do not fancy he was really *with* God, though I say so; there is something implied under the preposition πρὸς, which I do not stop to explain to you, because I conclude, that you, and every convert that comes after you, however unacquainted with the Greek language, *women* and *children*, will easily comprehend what I mean by *instinct*.

“καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος, 'And the word was God.' Do not mistake me; I mean, *God was the Word*; though contrary to grammar, depend upon it this is my particular meaning; or if you do not like this, mind that Θεός has, in this place, *no article* before it, therefore, at the utmost, it can only imply that the *Word* was *A* God,—perhaps you will think *Jupiter* or *Mercury*: not so, but yet *A* God, one, in short, of the Jewish *Elohim*; but take special care you do not account it one of the *Elohim* spoken of in Deut. vi. 4, for, of course, *it is impossible* I should mean any such thing; though, indeed, I know that you have been brought up to believe that the Word of God was the *appearing Jehovah*, and therefore might reasonably be accounted one of the *Elohim*, which God himself has told us, constitutes *ONE* Jehovah; but had I meant to describe him to be Jehovah, I should, you may be sure, have put the definitive article before Θεός, and called him ὁ Θεός, a distinction which in no manner belongs to him. Though, indeed, I well know that St. Matthew has blundered so greatly as to deceive you in this particular, when he tells you that the Messiah was to be God *WITH* us, that is, in *our* language, *Emmanuel*, in the blundering Greek of St. Matthew, μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός. This may not strike you at first sight; but depend upon it, he never meant *Jehovah*, he only meant *a* God in some way or other as I do; do not, therefore, on any account, attend to *his* insertion of the article, mind only *my* omission of it.

“I dare not proceed, though I am sorry to say, ideas still more strange crowd in upon my mind; But ridicule is no test

of truth one way or the other; and I should scorn to use it, especially upon such a topic, otherwise than to shew, by some such brief specimen, how nearly it borders upon an actual *absurdity*, to suppose that a *Jewish* Evangelist could, in those days, have so expressed himself, subject to the interpretation which Unitarians *now* put upon his words.

"[I should willingly have transcribed, as remarkably applicable to the above note, the remarks of the learned *Witsius*, (Misc. Sacr. tom. ii. pp. 591, 592,) on the *Socinian* mode of interpreting Scripture, but that it is now to be found at length in a work of greater notoriety than my own, the celebrated Discourses and Dissertations of my learned friend Dr. Magee, (now Dean of Cork,) on *Sacrifice and Atonement*, so often cited in these pages. See his *third* edition, vol. i. 189."]

See the Note, p. 100, in Dr. Nares' "Remarks on the Improved Version."

No. V.

ON THE WORD "ΑΥΤΡΟΝ."

"THEY (the Unitarians) tell us also, in their note on Matt. xx. 28, that Christ's death as *Αυτρον αντι πολλων*, a ransom for many, was NOT the suffering of a substitute. We might suppose from this that such a meaning could not be expressed by the term ransom, since they are so exceedingly careful to do away every impression of that nature; why then, let me ask, do they so industriously select the very term ransom for the rendering of *ανταλλαγμα*, Mark viii. 37, setting aside the received text, and the primate's rendering 'in exchange for?' When it suits their purpose, it seems, *ransom* more strongly expresses the substitution of one thing for another than even the terms 'in exchange for;' when it does *not*, we may none of us venture to give it any such meaning. I am obliged to

speak in this manner of their bold and unjustifiable adulterations of the WORD OF GOD! Only a few pages further they again render λυτρον αντι πολλων a ransom for many, Mark x. 45, and send us back to their note on Matt. xx. 28, to prove that our Saviour's life given as a ransom, can in no manner imply the sufferings of a substitute; I do not deny that ανταλλαγμα may be rendered 'ransom,' or that λυτρον may sometimes express deliverance generally; but I contend, that if our Saviour gave his life as a ransom according to the Evangelist, and died in our stead, αντι πολλων, for, or *instead of*, many, which the Greek expresses^a, both λυτρον in the original, and ransom in the received version, are to be taken in their literal and proper sense; and the pretended correction of the text is an open falsification of it. 'Ye were not redeemed,' (or ransomed, ελυτρωθητε,) says St. Peter, 'with corruptible things, as silver and gold^b, (the price paid, that is, consisted not in actual money, or things bought with money,) but with the precious blood of Christ; *this was* the price paid, *this was* the literal and positive price wherewith 'ye were bought;' as another Apostle expresses it, 1 Cor. vi. 20. We still are pressed with notes and expositions, to induce us to think of nothing but *seals* and *ratifications*, but we must abide by what is written, and persist in acknowledging a *ransom*, a *price*, and a *purchased* redemption; nor though they should insist ever so upon our doing otherwise, shall I cease to regard the ransom of his blood-shedding as the suffering of a substitute, while I have the positive testimony both of St. Paul and St. Peter to the fact, that 'Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, by being made a curse for us,' Gal. iii. 13; that he 'suffered for sins, the just for the unjust,' 1 Pet. i. 18; that 'he died for our sins^c,' 1 Cor. xv. 3;

^a "What the Evangelist expresses by λυτρον αντι πολλων, St. Paul terms αντι λυτρον υπερ παντων. 1 Tim. ii. 6. Upon which see Outram de Sacrificiis, Lib. ii. c. vi. §. 4. p. 337."

^b "1 Pet. i. 18, 19."

^c " 'Died for our sins;' 1 Cor. xv. 3, υπερ των αμαρτιων ημων. We are bidden to take notice that 'the true reading of' Gal. i. 4, is περι των α. η. and not υπερ, that the expression is very general, q. d. in relation to our sins. Of course υπερ, if it differs materially from περι, must be allowed its full force in the passage cited above from the first Epistle to the Corinthians. Whitby considers them as equivalent.

‘died for the ungodly,’ and ‘was delivered for our offences,’ Rom. v. 6. iv. 25.” *Nares.*

(The reader is also referred to the Introductory Remarks.)

No. VI.

ON THE HOLY GHOST AND TRINITY.

“THE eternal existence of God, his nature, and many of his attributes, are incomprehensible to man^c. The Scriptures

See his *Examen Var. Lect. Millii*, and in his notes on Rom. viii. 3, he shows that *περι αμαρτιων*, according to the language of the Old Testament, signifies a sin-offering. See also Magee on Atonement, vol. i. p. 234—243, third edit. and his 29th note, p. 245, in which the arguments which the Socinians draw from the Scripture use of the prepositions *αντι*, *υπερ*, *δια*, and *περι*, are briefly, but very sufficiently answered. See also Outram de Sacrificiis, lib. ii. cap. vi. §. 2. p. 345.”

^c “The consistency of the foreknowledge of God with the free-will of man, in the sense in which the prescience of God has been understood, is one of those things which has generally been considered inexplicable. The prescience of the Deity, however, may be put in a light, which, consistently, as it seems, with all due reverence to God and the perfection of his attributes, appears to remove the difficulty; whether it may be admitted, must be left for consideration. We are informed, that God spares when we deserve punishment, and in his wrath thinketh upon mercy. He is also said to give us a greater or less measure of his assistance. When he forgives a sincere penitent, he relaxes in the exercise of his justice, for in his sight no man living can be justified. From these and various other expressions in Scripture, it appears, that in the purposes of God, the suspension or limitation of the exercise of one attribute, may be necessary for admitting the exercise of another. If God see it proper to punish a man for his faults, he cannot exert his mercy to counteract that punishment. In merely physical matters there may be no limitations of his power; the systems of bodies in unbounded space, may, without any interference, be extended at the will of the Deity; but in the exertion of his moral attributes, acting as it were together for the greatest good, limitations or suspensions may be necessary to produce the best effect. When we say God can do every thing which is possible, he limits that possibility by what is fit and right to be done. Now it implies no imperfection in the power of God, that man should be a free agent, since, if he be, God made him so. In fact, if man be not free, he is not an agent, but a mere instrument, and consequently no more accountable for his actions than a sword is for kill-

represent God as One; they also speak of Three Persons, by whose co-operation the government of the moral world is

ing a man, or a falling stone for crushing him to death. But it is said, that, if God foresee, he *must* influence, because that which he foresees must be certain in the event, which it could not be, if the event were altogether under the direction of another being endowed with free agency; thus free agency and foreknowledge are thought to be incompatible. Here we may apply what has been premised, that, if God should think proper to make man a free agent, he may suspend or limit the exercise of his faculty of prescience, supposing in this case such to be necessary; for we here go upon that supposition. We are assured from Scripture of the prescience of God; every prophecy which we have seen fulfilled is a proof of this. In the rise and fall of nations, in public blessings and calamities, and whatever may respect the general state of human affairs, and occasionally what may in these cases respect individuals, all these and other matters, in which the general welfare is concerned, are undoubtedly foreseen and under the direction of God; but individually as matters simply between God and man, as what may regard his eternal state, man is undoubtedly a free agent, and it does not appear to be derogatory to God, if he here be pleased not to exert his attribute of prescience, this appearing to be a case similar to that of suspending the exertion of some of his attributes to make room for the exercise of others, in circumstances where the dispensation of God may require it. But during this suspension or limitation, granted to take place, God still sees *how* man acts, and he remains equally at the disposal of God, as if he were then under his direction. Thus man is never out of the hands of his Maker, being always subject to his control, and at the same time continues a free agent, and therefore a proper subject of reward and punishment. To constitute free agency, whatever may be necessary can argue no imperfection in the admission, since, to accomplish an end, the necessary means must be employed. Here necessity removes the difficulty in respect to what might otherwise be considered as operating against the perfection of God's attributes. If on certain occasions God see it proper not to exercise his justice or his mercy, we still consider these attributes in him as perfect; why, then, not say the same of his prescience? To do every thing which is proper in the accomplishing of those purposes which God may think fit to execute, constitutes perfection. With God, every thing which is proper is every thing which is possible. When we say all the attributes of God are perfect, we mean that he *can* and that he *does* always exert them for the best possible ends. Speaking of God, possibility is always in subordination to propriety, to what is fit that God should do. God can do no evil, but we do not thence say that his power is under any control. Admitting, then, what is here advanced, the free agency of man appears to be consistent with the prescience of God. On this subject, however, we must speak with great reverence and caution; for after all our attempts to solve what has been considered as an inconsistency, there may be no contradiction. 'Man seeth not as God seeth.' In our attempts to reconcile apparent inconsistencies, we may be fighting with a phantom of our own raising. It takes away, however, the force of a difficulty as an objection, if we can show how it *may* be solved. That freedom of will is necessary to render man an accountable being, is evident from hence, that a being who acts only as he is acted upon, is a mere machine; for to oblige a being to act, transfers the action and all its consequences to him who imposes the obligation. To adore, to praise, to give thanks, and render all such services to God as can be acceptable to him, and be the ground of reward to the agent, necessarily imply freedom of will in him who offers them up."

carried on, all things relating to man in his moral capacity being stated as under their direction and influence. This has created a difficulty, but it is a difficulty arising from our inability to comprehend the things spoken of. Whether the union be in essence, or in co-operation; how we are to understand the connection, or what may be the relation of the Three Persons constituting the divine government, we presume not to form even a conjecture. Here we declare our perfect ignorance; and on this subject we wish to speak only the language of Scripture, not venturing to go a step farther than we are thereby warranted; and we protest against any explanations being imposed on us, knowing how easy it is to give an absurd meaning to any thing, and then turn it into ridicule. Admitting then the divine authority of the Old and New Testament, whatever may be there taught respecting this doctrine, we are bound to receive; for it being altogether a matter of revelation, neither reason nor natural religion can give us any assistance. We are not allowed to say, I do not comprehend, therefore I cannot believe; for on that ground we might deny the existence of God, he himself being the greatest mystery^d. Man perplexes himself with difficulties, when he should be consulting evidence to establish his belief. If in revealed religion we reason on the propriety of God's dispensations, or in natural religion, on causes, we are in danger of being led towards Deism in the former

^d "A mystery in religion is either what we have no ability to comprehend, or what cannot be understood without a divine revelation. It seems to be the term *mystery* which gives so much offence; for no objection can be made to its signification. A certain man who was blind from his birth, feeling, as he said, no imperfection in himself, thought for a long time he was imposed upon when talked to about the sense of seeing; but was at length thus convinced: 'I was put,' said he, 'at a distance from another person, yet he would tell me every thing I did, whether I stood or sat, held up my hand, or set it down, and the like, whereas I could tell nothing he did unless I felt him with my hands.' Thus he was made sensible of the existence of something, which to him was totally incomprehensible. In respect to the admission of what cannot be understood without further explanation, do not we, in the exercise of parental authority, require obedience before the reasons of our precepts are understood? Why then deny the same right to the great Parent of mankind? When our Saviour uttered dark sayings, his disciples did not forsake him; they still believed him to be the Son of God. The 'secret things belong unto the Lord our God; but those things which are revealed belong unto us.' "

case, and Atheism in the latter. Hence, for instance, Dr. Priestley, (as we may judge from his own statement*,) fell from the height of Calvinism to the borders of natural religion; and Mr. Hume was led to Atheism from his inability to account for the order of the physical world. Men do not consider what they ought seriously to consider, that in disputing against what they do not comprehend, they may be impeaching the wisdom and goodness of God.

* “ Dr. Priestley, in his *Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever*, says he was once a ‘ Calvinist, and that of the straitest sect;’ afterwards, he adds, he became ‘ an high Arian, next a low Arian, and then a Socinian, and in a little time a Socinian of the lowest kind,’ in which Christ is considered as a mere man, the son of Joseph and Mary, and naturally as *fallible* and *peccable* as Moses or any other prophet. And after all he tells us, (*Defence of Unitar.* 1787. p. 111.) that he ‘ does not know when his creed will be fixed.’ Thus, (as Dr. Magee observes,) his Bible, like his almanac, is suited only to a particular season. After, however, rendering suspicious the moral character of our Saviour, we think he could not go much further. ‘ Their device is only to put him out whom God will exalt.’ Dr. P. began the study of the Scriptures at an early age, and yet when he wrote the above-mentioned defence, he had no fixed creed. As a *natural* philosopher, his writings shew him to have been a man of great penetration, expert in investigation, and deducing conclusions; notwithstanding which, having studied Christianity the greater part of his life, he was not able to establish his faith. Whatever was the cause, he was no *Christian* philosopher. As a teacher of Christianity, we might justly have said to him, ‘ Why dost thou teach my laws, and take my covenant in thy mouth?’—‘ Thou that teachest another, teachest thou not thyself?’ Difficulties arise in the *word* of God which human reason cannot explain, and in his *works*, which are unaccountable; so *God* is rejected in the latter case, and the *mysteries* of religion in the former, for the vain purpose of removing the difficulties. This is like supporting the world on an elephant, and the elephant on a tortoise. Dr. P. has given us the following summary of the system of education in the academy at Hackney, over which he presided: ‘ In my time, the academy was in a state peculiarly favourable to the serious pursuit of truth, as the students were about equally divided upon every question of much importance, such as liberty and necessity, the sleep of the soul, and all the articles of theological orthodoxy and heresy; in consequence of which, all these topics were the subjects of continual discussion. Our tutors were of different opinions: Dr. Ashworth taking the orthodox side, Mr. Clarke, the sub-tutor, that of heresy, though always with the greatest modesty.’ Thus, the most difficult and important matters which can engage the attention of man, were to be decided by the wrangling of ignorant boys. Again, ‘ there was no provision for teaching the learned languages. We had even no compositions or orations in Latin. Our course of lectures was also defective, in containing no lectures on the Scriptures, or on ecclesiastical history; and by the students in general, (and Mr. Alexander and myself were no exceptions,) commentators in general, and ecclesiastical history also, were held in contempt.’ That this system of education should lead to scepticism and infidelity, is not to be wondered at; accordingly Mr. Belsham admits that the pupils had gone beyond their tutors *a little too far.*”

“The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians concludes with these words: ‘The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all.’ Here the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are distinctly and separately included in the recommendation; we are made equally interested in them all, and therefore must regard each as equally intitled to the appellation of *person*; if we consider the Holy Ghost only as an attribute of the Father, it is included in the Father. Again (Jude 20, 21,) ‘but ye, beloved, building up yourselves in your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost, keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ, unto eternal life.’ Here we are desired to apply to God, to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, for assistance in the great work of our salvation. And Jesus, in his last address to his disciples, commands them to go and teach all nations, and ‘baptize them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;’ here, three persons are clearly implied, and included in the office of baptism. A distinction of persons is also pointed out in the following text: ‘Through the Son we have access by one Spirit unto the Father,’ (Eph. ii. 18.) Further, (John xiv. 26. xv. 26,) ‘the Comforter which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, *he* shall teach you all things.’—‘I will send unto you from the Father, the Spirit of Truth who proceedeth from the Father, he shall bear witness of me.’ Dr. Watts here observes, that the word *he* in Greek is *ἐκεῖνος*, which is always used for a *person*. The same Greek word is also used for the Holy Ghost, in chap. xvi. 8. 13, 14. We are also said to be created by God, redeemed by his Son, and sanctified by the Holy Ghost; distinct personal actions are ascribed to them all, and such as cannot be attributed to each of them; and to the two latter, the Scriptures have applied the highest titles and properties of God; many things are spoken of them, which cannot be applied to any created being^f. To bring

^f “To the Son and to the Holy Ghost are applied, the name *Jehovah*, (the *peculiar* name of God,) the attributes of omniscience and omnipresence, to each we are dedicated, &c. &c. Now if Christ and the Holy Ghost were not partakers of the Godhead with the Father, if they had not some communion in the divine nature, God, who is said to be *jealous of his honour*, and *who will not give his glory and his name to another*,

case, and Atheism in the latter. Hence Priestley, (as we may judge from his e from the height of Calvinism to the hor gion; and Mr. Hume was led to Atheis to account for the order of the physical consider what they ought seriously to c. puting against what they do not compr impeaching the wisdom and goodness of

• “ Dr. Priestley, in his *Letters to a Philosophical U* Calvinist, and that of the strictest sect; afterwards, I Arian, next a low Arian, and then a Socinian, and in lowest kind,’ in which Christ is considered as a mere Mary, and naturally as fallible and *peccable* as *Moss* after all he tells us, (*Defence of Unitar.* 1787. p. 111. his creed will be fixed.’ Thus, (as Dr. Magee observe in suited only to a particular season. After, however character of our Saviour, we think he could not go t only to put him out whom God will exalt.’ Dr. P. i at an early age, and yet when he wrote the abov fixed creed. As a natural philosopher, his writing great penetration, expert in investigation, and ded which, having studied Christianity the greater pu tablish his faith. Whatever was the cause, he teacher of Christianity, we might justly have sai laws, and take my covenant in thy mouth?— thou not thyself?’ Difficulties arise in the word explain, and in his *works*, which are unaccount case, and the *mysteries* of religion in the forme difficulties. This is like supporting the world tortoise. Dr. P. has given us the following the academy at Hackney, over which he pre in a state peculiarly favourable to the seriou about equally divided upon every question necessity, the sleep of the soul, and all the ar in consequence of which, all these topics Our tutors were of different opinions: Dr. Clarke, the sub-tutor, that of heresy, th Thus, the most difficult and important n man, were to be decided by the wranglin provision for teaching the learned languag tions in Latin. Our course of lectures w on the Scriptures, or on ecclesiastical hist Mr. Alexander and myself were no excep elastical history also, were held in conte. lead to scepticism and infidelity, is not u admits that the pupils had gone beyond t

mankind then to a state of immortal happiness, it is manifestly pointed out to be by the joint influence of three divine persons; and our duties to each arise out of the relations in which they stand to us. In this there is no mystery. But as the Deity is not represented as a Being distinct from these three persons, how they may be united in a common nature, or in what sense we are to understand their union, we attempt not to explain; we pretend not to be wise 'above that which is written.'"

Vince's "Caution against being misled by the Unitarian Interpretation of Scripture," &c.

would never have laid such a stumbling-block, such a snare in our way, as must naturally lead us into idolatry—to consider and to worship the creature as the Creator. The consequences to which principles lead, is frequently the best way to settle the question."

THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

THE great object of the English Reformers was to retain the body and constitution of the Primitive Church, only discarding such tenets and superstitions as had been introduced by mere human authority, subsequent to the Apostolic times.

The Church of England retains, therefore, the primitive form of Church Government as nearly as can be collected from the history of the early ages, viz. that by Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.

It allows of other offices in the church; such as Metropolitans and Archdeacons for the purpose of order and regulation; but the above are the only orders which it considers as sacred or apostolical.

The first principle which this church assumes as the ground-work of its doctrines and tenets is, that no article of faith shall be believed by any man, or thought necessary to salvation, which is not contained in those canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority there never was any doubt in the church.

Secondly, It asserts the doctrine of a Divine Trinity existing in the Unity of the Godhead as a Scriptural doctrine; and also adopts all the other Articles of Faith which are set forth in the Athanasian, the Nicene, and the Apostles' Creeds.

Thirdly, It agrees with the Calvinists in admitting the doctrine of original sin, or that original corruption which is attached to the nature of man by the transgression of our first parents. It also asserts the justification of man through the atonement and merits of Jesus Christ.

Fourthly, The efficacy and virtue of the Divine grace (which is commonly termed the ordinary operation of the Holy Ghost) in influencing the wills and affections of mankind, and directing them to the performance of works of faith and righteousness, is strongly contended for in the Articles of this Church.

Fifthly, It treats of the very difficult and obscure questions relating to Predestination and Election, with a becoming moderation, and restricts the favour and mercy of God to no particular society of believers.

Sixthly, With respect to the Sacraments, it admits of only two—Baptism and the Lord's Supper; and considers them merely as outward and visible signs of an inward and spiritual grace, which is the consequence and effect of faith.

In other respects, the Church of England agrees with the great body of Protestants, in rejecting the Romish doctrines relating to the Pope's supremacy, the traditions of the church, transubstantiation, purgatory, penance, auricular confession, image-worship, invocation of saints, masses for the dead, monastic vows, and the admitting more sacraments in the church than two.

SUMMARY

OF THE

PRINCIPAL ERRORS DETAILED IN THIS VOLUME,

AND A

REFUTATION OF THEM,

BY TEXTS WHICH SUPPORT THE TENETS OF THE

Church of England.

ADOPTIANS, or followers of Felix D'Urgel,	considered the title of "Son of God" as merely used to express in a particular manner the choice that God had made of Jesus Christ	John i. 1. 18. v. 18. 23. Heb. i. 8.
AMALRIC'S DISCIPLES	contended, that now, sacraments and all external worship should be abolished	Matthew xxvi. 27. xxviii. 19; 20. Acts ii. 38. 1 Cor. xi. 25, 26. Gal. iii. 27. Matthew xvi. 27. 2 Cor. v. 10. Gal. vi. 7; 8, 9. 2 Tim. ii. 19. Titus ii. 10. 14. James ii. 14—26. Rev. xx. 12. xxii. 12. Mark x. 14. 16. Acts xvi. 33. 1 Cor. i. 16.
AMSDORF	denied the necessity of good works	Baptism is an initiatory Christian rite, analogous to the Circumcision of the Jews.
ANABAPTISTS	baptize only adults	

A SUMMARY OF THE PRINCIPAL ERRORS, &c.

ANTINOMIANS	maintain, that the books of the Old Testament are no rule of our faith under the Gospel	{ Matth. v. 17—19. Luke xviii. 31. xix. 44. 46, Acts xvii. 2. xxiv. 14. x. 43. xviii. 28. xxviii. 23.
	that good works are not necessary in respect of salvation, Christ having fulfilled all the demands of God's law in our stead,	{ 1 Pet. i. 17. 1 Cor. ix. 27. See Amadorf.
APOLLINARIS	denied in some measure the humanity of Christ	{ John i. 14. Heb. ii. 16, 17. iv. 15.
APOSTOLICS	declined taking an oath	See Quakers.
APOTACTITES, followers of } Tatian,	condemned marriage	{ 1 Cor. vii. 2. ix. 5. 1 Tim. iv. 3. v. 14. Heb. xiii. 14. Marriage was countenanced by Christ. John ii. 1, 2. John iv. 24. v. 37. vi. 46. 1 Tim. vi. 16.
ARDÆUS	attributed to the Deity a human form.....	{ John v. 23. x. 30. 38.
ARIUS and ARIANS	maintained, that Christ is inferior to the Father both in nature and dignity	{
	_____ that the Holy Ghost is not God; } confine their worship to God the Father	{ See Unitarians.
BARDESANES	regarded Satan as the enemy of God, but not his creature	{ Coloss. i. 16.
	contended, that Jesus Christ had not assumed a human body	{ John i. 14. Heb. ii. 16, 17.
	that we shall not rise with the same body which we had when on earth	{ See Quakers.
CELESTIUS	See Pelagius.	

CAIANUS	maintained, that the divine nature of Christ insinuated itself into the human in the conception thereof, changed its condition, and rendered it incorruptible	{ John i. 14. Heb. ii. 17.
CALVIN.....	maintained, that God predestinated from all eternity one part of mankind to everlasting happiness, and the other to endless misery	{ Matt. x. 22. Mark xvi. 16. Luke xiii. 3. Acts ii. 21. Rom. x. 4. 9. Gal. iii. 22. 1 Tim. ii. 6.
	<u> </u> those whom God has called and sanctified by his Spirit, shall never finally fall from a state of grace	{ 1 Cor. ix. 27. x. 12.
CAMPANUS	taught, that the Holy Ghost is merely a denomination used to shew the nature of the Father and the Son	{ See Unitarians.
COLLYRIDIANs	worshipped the Virgin as a goddess	Matt. iv. 10.
COPTs	observe the custom of circumcision	Acts xv. 5. 29.
EUTYCHIANs	admitted but of one nature in Christ	{ Isa. ix. 6. John iii. 13. Rom. i. 3. ix. 5. 1 Cor. ii. 8. Gal. iv. 4. Philip. ii. 6, 7. 1 Tim. iii. 16.
FELIX OF URGEL	See Adoptians.	
FLAGELLANTES, or WHIPPERS	chastised their bodies by way of penance	Joel ii. 13, Ps. li. 17.
GNOSTICS	a branch of this denomination supposed the world to have been created by the evil principle	{ Gen. i. 1. John i. 3. Coloss. i. 16.
	some also supposed, that Jesus had only the appearance of humanity	{ Luke i. 31, 32, John i. 14. Heb. ii. 16, 17.

A SUMMARY OF THE PRINCIPAL ERRORS, &c.

Because the Spirit proceedeth from the Father, therefore it is called the Spirit of God, and the Spirit of the Father. Matt. x. 20. 1 Cor. ii. 11, 12. Now the same Spirit is also called the Spirit of the Son, Gal. iv. 6. Rom. viii. 9. Philip. i. 19. 1 Pet. i. 11. If then the Holy Ghost be called the Spirit of God and the Father, because he proceedeth from the Father, it followeth, that, being called also the Spirit of the Son, he proceedeth also from the Son.

See Roman Catholics.

John i. 3. Coloss. i. 16.

Heb. vii. 15. The Apostle in this chapter compares the type with the antitype, and in this verse plainly declares Christ to be *another* person.

See Quakers.

See the refutation of transubstantiation, Art. Roman Catholics. See Calvin.

GREEK CHURCH maintains, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father only

directs its members to invoke the Virgin and the saints

HERMOGENES supposed matter to be the source of all evil, and that it was pre-existent and eternal

HUTCHINSON maintained, that Melchisedeck was the second person of the Trinity in a human form

INSPIRE's in Germany do not observe the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper

LUTHER taught the doctrine of consubstantiation, or impanation
advocated predestination

MACEDONIUS supposed, that the third person of the Trinity }
 was merely a divine energy, and not a distinct } See Unitarians.
 person }

MALAKANS reject the sacraments See Quakers.

MANES and MANICHÆANS .. supposed that there was another being with the }
 power of creating besides God } See Gnostics.
 rejected the Old Testament..... { Matt. v. 17, 18. Luke xxiv. 44. Acts
 xxviii. 23.
 taught that Christ had only the appearance of }
 humanity } See Gnostics.

MENNO supposed that our Saviour's body was not formed }
 of the substance of the Virgin, but was brought } Matt. i. 18. John i. 14.
 from heaven }

administered baptism to adults only See Anabaptists.

MOLTER contended, that there are no degrees of faith, that }
 no man has any degree of it before he has the full } Luke xvii. 5. Rom. xii. 3. 6. Ephes. iv. 7.
 assurance }

MONOPHYSITES maintained, that in Christ the divine and human }
 nature were reduced into one } See Eutychians.

MONTANUS' DISCIPLES admitted women to the priesthood and episco- }
 pacy } 1 Tim. ii. 12.

MYSTICS, or QUIETISTS supposed the whole of religion to consist in con- }
 templation and prayer } Matt. v. 16. Heb. xiii. 16.

A SUMMARY OF THE PRINCIPAL ERRORS, &c.

NOETUS.....	See Praxeas and Sabellius	
ORIGEN.....	taught that the Son is inferior to the Father	John v. 23. x. 30. 38.
PASAGINIANS	affirmed, that the law of Moses is obligatory upon Christians in every thing except the offering of sacrifices	Acts xv.
	they denied the divinity of Christ	See Unitarians.
PAUL OF SAMOSATA	contended, that the Son and Holy Ghost exist in God, as the faculties of reason and activity in men	See Unitarians.
PAULICIANS, or PAULIANS.....	understood the bread and wine administered by Christ at the last supper, as signifying the <i>divine discourses</i> , which are a spiritual food	John vi. 55.
	by the baptismal water, understood the Gospel ..	Acts viii. 36—38.
PELAGIUS.....	opposed the doctrine of original sin, and contended that Adam would have died though he had not sinned	Gen. ii. 17. Rom. v. 12. 19. vi. 23. 1 Cor. xv. 22. Ephes. ii. 3.
	taught, that good works are the only condition of salvation	John iii. 5. Rom. x. 9. Heb. xi. 6.
	—— that man may arrive at perfection even without grace	Luke xvii. x. John xv. 5. Rom. vii. 25. Gal. v. 17. 1 John i. 8.
PHOTINUS	understood the Holy Spirit to be merely a celestial virtue	See Unitarians.

PRAXEAS	affirmed, that it was the Father himself who was incarnate and suffered for us	{ John i. 16. v. 37. vi. 46, 1 Tim. vi. 16.
PRESBYTERIANS	objected to the hierarchy of the Church of England	{ See King Charles's Paper to the Parliament Divines, P. 382.
QUAKERS	suppose that the Holy Spirit has in every age and state of the world been in degree afforded to mankind	{ John xv. 26. xvi. 7.
	do not observe the sacrament of baptism	{ Matt. xxviii. 19. Acts viii. 36. 38. Gal. iii. 27.
	————— Lord's Supper	{ Luke xxii. 19. 1 Cor. x. 16. xi. 24.
	refuse to take an oath	{ Christ answered when put on oath: Matt. xxvi. 63, 64, Gen. xxii. 16, 17. Luke i. 73. Acts ii. 30. Heb. vi. 16, 17. 2 Sam. xxii. 35. Ps. cxliv. 1.
	————— engage in war	{ 2 Sam. xxii. 35. Ps. cxliv. 1.
	denounce capital punishment	{ Levit. xxiv. 17. Rom. xiii. 4.
	contend that there is no need of any external mission to the ministerial office, but every gifted Christian may preach or exhort	{ Acts xiv. 23. 1 Tim. iv. 14.
	allow females to take a part in the ministry	{ 1 Tim. ii. 12.
	make no provision for their clergy	{ Matt. x. 10. Luke viii. 3. 1 Cor. ix. 7. 11. 2 Cor. viii. 13, 14.
	believe in a resurrection of the body, but not of the same body which dies	{ Job xix. 25, 26, 27. John v. 28. Rom. viii. 11. Rev. xx. 13.
ROMAN CATHOLICS	maintain, that Christ left the Apostle Peter his vicar over the whole Christian church, and the pope his successor	{ Matt. xix. 28. xxviii. 19. Acts. xv. John xx. 21, 22. 1 Cor. i. 12. iii. 4. 2 Cor. xii. 5. xii. 11. Gal. ii. 11. 3 John 9.

ROMAN CATHOLICS maintain, that the unity of the Christian church doth not consist in her having one Lord, one faith, one baptism, and one hope of her calling; but in having one bishop under Christ to be her monarchical head

2 Cor. i. 24. Ephes. v. 23.

assert, that the Scriptures are not to be read by all men { John v. 39. Acts xvii. 11. 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16, 17. Rev. i. 3.

— that the Scriptures are not a perfect rule of faith and manners; but the traditions of the Fathers, and decrees of popes and councils, ought to be a part of our rule of faith and practice pray in a language not understood by many present

Prov. xxx. 6. Isa. viii. 20. xxix. 13. Matt. xv. 9. John xx. 31. 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16, 17. Rev. xxii. 18.

1 Cor. xiv. ii. 19.

Christ was yet among us, when he said, "*This is my body.*"

It is therefore a figurative mode of expression, and must be understood to mean, This is the representation or sign of my body, in the same sense as the lamb is called the passover.

The bread could not be Christ's natural body whilst he was alive; for it was his body that performed the action of breaking and giving the bread; nor could the wine in the cup be his blood, for that was still flowing in his veins.

hold the doctrine of transubstantiation

ROMAN CATHOLICS	withhold the cup from the laity	Mark xiv. 23. 1 Cor. xi. 26. 28.
grant indulgences	{ This assumed right being founded on works of supererogation performed by the saints, is at once refuted by St. Luke's words, xvii. 10.	
inflict penance		
	Joel ii. 13. Ps. li. 17.	
	{ The uniform language of Scripture is, that there will be a great Day of Judg- ment, a general assize; when all must appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; and that the sentence pro- nounced on that day will be unchange- able and eternal.	
advocate the doctrine of purgatory		
	{ But in no part of Scripture are we in- formed, that immediately after death the soul goes into purgatory, or a place of <i>temporal</i> punishment. See Matt. x. 15. xxiv. 30, 31. xxv. 31, 32. 46. 1 Cor. xv. 52. 2 Pet. ii. 9. iii. 7. 12.	
invoke the Virgin, angels, and saints	{ Jerem. xvii. 5. Gal. iv. 8. Philip. iv. 6. Coloss. ii. 18. 1 Tim. ii. 5.	
venerate relics and images	Exod. xx. 4. Deut. iv. 16.	
do not allow their priests to marry	{ 1 Cor. vii. 2. ix. 5. 1 Tim. iii. 2. iv. 3. Heb. xiii. 4.	

ROMAN CATHOLICS maintain, that the unity of the Christian church doth not consist in her having one Lord, one faith, one baptism, and one hope of her calling; but in having one bishop under Christ to be her monarchical head
assert, that the Scriptures are not to be read by all men
— that the Scriptures are not a perfect rule of faith and manners; but the traditions of the Fathers, and decrees of popes and councils, ought to be a part of our rule of faith and practice
pray in a language not understood by many present

2 Cor. i. 24. Ephes. v. 23.

John v. 39. Acts xvii. 11. 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16, 17. Rev. i. 3.

Prov. xxx. 6. Isa. viii. 20. xxix. 13. Matt. xv. 9. John xx. 31. 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16, 17. Rev. xxii. 18.

1 Cor. xiv. ii. 19.

Christ was yet among us, when he said, "*This is my body.*"

It is therefore a figurative mode of expression, and must be understood to mean, This is the representation or sign of my body, in the same sense as the lamb is called the passover.

The bread could not be Christ's natural body whilst he was alive; for it was his body that performed the action of breaking and giving the bread; nor could the wine in the cup be his blood, for that was still flowing in his veins.

hold the doctrine of transubstantiation

grant indulgences	Mark xiv. 23. 1 Cor. xi. 26. 28.
inflict penance	{ This assumed right being founded on works of supererogation performed by the saints, is at once refuted by St. Luke's words, xvii. 10.
advocate the doctrine of purgatory	Joel ii. 13. Ps. li. 17.
invoke the Virgin, angels, and saints	{ The uniform language of Scripture is, that there will be a great Day of Judg- ment, a general assize; when all must appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; and that the sentence pro- nounced on that day will be unchange- able and eternal. But in no part of Scripture are we in- formed, that immediately after death the soul goes into purgatory, or a place of temporal punishment. See Matt. x. 15. xxiv. 30, 31. xxv. 31, 32. 46. 1 Cor. xv. 52. 2 Pet. ii. 9. iii. 7. 12.
venerate relics and images	{ Jerem. xvii. 5. Gal. iv. 8. Philip. iv. 6. Coloss. ii. 18. 1 Tim. ii. 5.
do not allow their priests to marry	Exod. xx. 4. Deut. iv. 16. { 1 Cor. vii. 2. ix. 5. 1 Tim. iii. 2. iv. 3. Heb. xiii. 4.

A SUMMARY OF THE PRINCIPAL ERRORS, &c.

RUSSIAN CHURCH See Greek Church.

SABBATARIANS keep holy the Jewish Sabbath, or Saturday

It is evident from Acts ix. 7. and 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2. that the practice of the primitive Christians to assemble, for the purpose of worship, on the *first day* of the week, in commemoration of Christ's resurrection, had the sanction of St. Paul himself.

SABELLIUS affirmed, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are but *three several names*, or *notions*, or *modes*, of one and the selfsame thing

Matt. xxviii. 19. 2 Cor. xiii. 14.

SCOTCH CHURCH See Presbyterians.

SEVERUS maintained, that only a part of the human body was the workmanship of God, (the good principle)

Gen. i. 27. ii. 7. Coloss. i. 16.

SOCINI denied the divinity of Christ personality of the Holy Ghost plenary inspiration of the Scriptures

See Unitarians.

SUPRALAPSARIANS maintained, that God had from all eternity decreed the transgression of Adam, in such a manner, that our first parents could not possibly have avoided that fatal event

Gen. ii. 17. iii. 14.

SWEDENBORGIANS maintain, that there is only one person in the Godhead, viz. Christ, and that he always existed in the human form

John i. 18. v. 37. vi. 46. 1 Tim. vi. 16.

THEODOTUS (THE BANKER)	contended for the superiority of Melchisedeck over Jesus Christ	{ Heb. vii. 15, 16. 26.
TRITHEISTS	imagined in the Deity three natures, or substances, absolutely equal in all respects, and joined together by no common essence	{ Deut. vi. 4. John x. 30. 1 Cor. viii. 6. 1 John v. 7.
UNITARIANS	deny the divinity of Christ	{ John i. 1. v. 23. x. 30. Acts xx. 28. Rom. ix. 5. Titus ii. 13. 1 John ii. 23. iii. 16. v. 20. 2 John 9. Rev. i. 8. xix. 16.
	—— pre-existence of Christ	{ John i. 1. 14. vii. 58. Rom. i. 3, 4. viii. 3. ix. 5. Philip. ii. 7. 1 Tim. iii. 16.
	—— miraculous conception of Christ	{ Isa. vii. 14. Matt. i. 18. 20. Luke i. 31. 35.
	—— atonement by the blood of Christ	{ Matt. xx. 28. Mark x. 45. Acts xx. 28. Rom. iii. 25. iv. 25. v. 6. Heb. ix. 12. 1 Cor. v. 7. vi. 20. vii. 23. xv. 17. Gal. iii. 13. 1 Pet. ii. 24. iii. 18. 1 John ii. 2. iv. 10. Rev. i. 5. v. 9.
	conjecture, that before Christ entered upon his public ministry, he was caught up to heaven, that he might receive proper instruction to qualify him	{ Luke ii. 47. Ephes. iv. 9. Coloss. ii. 3.
	assert, that Christ did not rise from the grave by his own power	{ John ii. 19. v. 21. Rev. i. 18.

A SUMMARY OF THE PRINCIPAL ERRORS, &c.

UNITARIANS..... assert, that Christ is not a proper object of worship { John v. 23. Rom. viii. 34. x. 13. 1 Cor. i. 2. Heb. vii. 25.

deny the divinity and personality of the Holy Ghost { Matt. xxviii. 19. John xiv. 26. xv. 26. xvi. 7. Acts v. 3. Rom. viii. 23. 1 Cor. ii. 10. 12. 2 Cor. xiii. 14. Ephes. iv. 30.

existence of angels, of Satan, and evil spirits { Matt. xiii. 39. xxv. 41. Luke ii. 13, 14. x. 17. xxi. 31. John viii. 44. xiii. 2. Acts xiii. 10. xxvi. 18. Rom. xvi. 20. 1 Cor. v. 5. vii. 5. 2 Cor. ii. 11. xi. 14. xii. 7. Ephes. iv. 27. vi. 11. 1 Thess. ii. 18. 2 Thess. ii. 9. 1 Tim. i. 20. iii. 6, 7. v. 15. 2 Tim. ii. 26. Heb. ii. 14. xii. 22. James iv. 7. 1 Pet. v. 8. 2 Pet. ii. 4. Jude 6.

plenary inspiration of Scripture { Matt. v. 18. John xvii. 7, 8. 2 Tim. iii. 16: 2 Pet. i. 20, 21.
separate existence of the soul { Luke xxiii. 43. Acts vii. 59. 2 Cor. v. 1.
that punishment will be everlasting..... { Matt. xxv. 46. Mark ix. 44. Rev. xiv. 10, 11.

UNIVERSALISTS maintain, that punishment will not be everlasting* See the last texts cited.

THE END.

[illegible]

H

「

」

